TWO CENTURIES OF SPENSERIAN SCHOLARSHIP

(1609—1805)

By JEWEL WURTSBAUGH

A dissertation submitted to the Board of University Studies of The Johns Hopkins University in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

1932

BALTIMORE
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
1936

TWO CENTURIES OF SPENSERIAN SCHOLARSHIP (1609–1805)

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

TWO CENTURIES OF SPENSERIAN SCHOLARSHIP

(1609—1805)

By JEWEL WURTSBAUGH

A dissertation submitted to the Board of University Studies of The Johns Hopkins University in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

1932

BALTIMORE
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
1936

COPYRIGHT 1936, THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

TO

PROFESSOR RAYMOND DEXTER HAVENS

"Nor was it common gratitude."

—Wordsworth

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41547016_0133

PREFATORY NOTE

I have not without reason limited this revision of my doctoral dissertation to the period between the significant dates, 1609-1805. I have thus omitted the poet's first commentator, that most interesting and altogether puzzling person known to scholars and lovers of Spenser as E. K. But I have done so deliberately, for although he shared the poetic intimacies of Spenser's mind, E. K. annotated Spenser's first considerable work rather than his last. Since his opinions could, therefore, hardly be definitive, I have begun with the folio text of the *Faerie Queene*. I concluded with the first variorum edition of Spenser's *Works* because, as a fairly complete compilation of Spenser-lore to the nineteenth century, this represents a landmark in the history of Spenserian scholarship. When the volume is past jeopardy, I hope to send after it another covering the period from 1805 to the variorum edition now being issued by The Johns Hopkins Press.

Within the years 1609-1805, I have studied in detail editions, commentaries, and biographical accounts, relative chiefly to accuracy of the text, scope and interest of the annotations, critical theories, anecdotes and facts of the poet's life, but with some view to showing that Spenserian problems were only one phase of the larger question of scholarship growing out of the critical standards and opinions in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. With increasing interest in antiquarianism, the neo-classical fear of pedantry waned. Scholars showed more and more willingness to undertake prolonged toil in order to correct or illuminate text. Specialization and emphasis upon the mechanics of research

have today alienated the scholar from the critic, but in these two earlier centuries the relation between scholarship and criticism was much closer and happier. There were no barriers; the scholar turned readily from research to criticism. This resulted in more comprehensive and appreciative studies of Spenser.

To the late Professor Edwin Greenlaw and to Professor Kemp Malone, I am under the deepest obligation for assistance and encouragement in the preparation of the work. Professor Charles G. Osgood and Dr. Edward N. Hooker read the manuscript. Professor Ernest A. Strathmann, Dr. Ray Heffner, and my colleagues at the University of Oklahoma have furnished details or criticisms of sundry nature. To Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Professor Gertude M. Hirst, Professor Ernest H. Wright, and my brother, J. T. Wurtsbaugh, I am more indebted than I can readily acknowledge. My students, Nelle Fuller, Hugh Comfort, and Agnes Sibley have assisted in the preparation of the manuscript.

Officers and attendants at the following libraries were unceasingly helpful: the British Museum, the Bodleian, Cambridge University, Trinity College (Cambridge), Chetham's, the John Rylands, Charterhouse, Marsh's, Trinity College (Dublin), The Johns Hopkins University, Peabody Institute, Library of Congress, Folger Shakespeare, Harvard, Yale, and Chicago Universities, and, especially, the University of Oklahoma.

J. W.

Norman, October 1935

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
One.	The First Hundred Years	1
Two.	John Hughes	33
Three.	Improvement of the Text	55
Four.	The High-Tide of Interest	73
Five.	Studies in Spenser's Sources	115
Six.	The First Variorum (1805)	139
	Conclusion	159
	Bibliography	161
	Index	167
	Vita	175

CHAPTER ONE

THE FIRST HUNDRED YEARS

CHAPTER ONE

THE FIRST HUNDRED YEARS

The first folio of the *Faerie Queene* (1609) and three folios of Spenser's *Works* (1611, 1617, 1679) were printed during the seventeenth century. Separate publications included: reprints of the *Shepheardes Calender* (1611) and *Mother Hubberds Tale* (1613)[1] obviously intended for the first folio of the *Works* (1611) but tied up singly; Sir James Ware's edition of *A View of Ireland* (1633); Theodore Bathurst's *Calendarium Pastorale* (1653) with the English text of the *Shepheardes Calender*; and *Spencer Redivivus* (1687), a paraphrase of the first book of the *Faerie Queene*. Scholarship is otherwise discovered in two commentaries by Sir Kenelm Digby, *Observations on the 22. Stanza in the 9th. Canto of the 2d. Book of Spencers Faery Queene* (1643) and *Concerning Edmund Spencer*, a discourse left in manuscript; in a number of brief lives by such scholars as Camden, Johnston, Ware, Fuller, Aubrey, Edward Phillips, and others; and in a definite concern for the poet's manuscript remains. A detailed account of the editions is given in part one of this chapter, the commentaries are discussed in part two, and the biographical studies are the subject of part three.

I

That Spenser was not painstaking is apparent in the two quartos of the *Faerie Queene*, the first of which, although cataloguing a fair number of "Faults Es-

[1] Perhaps other of the minor poems.

caped," neglects obvious errors, and the second of which ignores even "Faults Escaped"; evidence that, after having read his proof with more or less care in the first instance, the poet trusted to the printer's remarking his earlier corrections. Hence the repetition later of errata contrary to his desire. Innumerable minor variations in the doubling of letters etc., such as the poet would scarcely have bothered to alter, further differentiate the two texts. Having no manuscripts with which to compare the printed versions, we can only infer that, as in the case of his contemporaries, these last changes were made at the discretion of the printer according to an orthographical standard set at the printing house.[2]

Spenser died in 1599. Ten years later Mathew Lownes published the first folio of the *Faerie Queene* (1609), now augmented by *Two Cantos of Mutabilitie* together with a third "unperfite." From whom or how Lownes secured this unpublished portion of the poem, and by what authority the cantos were numbered, whether there was a note or notes upon the manuscript to that effect, are unknown. But that feature which chiefly distinguishes the folio is the presence of these "neuer before imprinted" cantos, which "both for Forme and Matter" appear to be "parcell of some following Booke . . . vnder the Legend of Constancie." H. J. Todd at one time thought that Gabriel Harvey might have been the editor of the volume, but afterwards was of the opinion that, had he been, Harvey probably would have furnished further information in regard to the *Mutabilitie* cantos.[3] Upton was convinced

[2] W. W. Greg, "An Elizabethan Printer and His Copy," *The Library*, 4th series, iv. 102-118.

[3] *The Works*, ed. Todd, i. clxxvii.

that readings in it different from any in the former editions came "originally from the poet himself." [4] At approximately the same time Ralph Church described it as "a new and fair" edition prepared with some pains, "but unhappily . . . directed to a wrong object," the addition of "many thousand stops" not found in preceding copies; [5] and Birch, eager to give a just representation of the text, collated it in 1751 with the second quarto, and in some instances employed it to correct mistakes in the latter.[6] Mr. J. C. Smith, a more recent critic, terms it "a respectable piece of work," and, contrary to Church, finds its punctuation "far more logical and consistent than either of the quartos." [7] Mr. Smith would identify the editor as a man not of Harvey's generation, but without adequate proof.[8]

The editor's indifference to the first and preference for the second quarto is illustrated in instances where a word has been dropped in the second. Thus, without turning to the reading of the earlier text, "For the coole shade him thither hastly got" (I. II. xxix. 2), he emended the later "For the coole shade thither hastly

[4] *Faerie Queene,* ed. Upton, i. xxxix.

[5] *Faerie Queene,* ed. Church, i. v.

[6] *Faerie Queene,* ed. 1751, i. xxxvii.

[7] *Faerie Queene,* ed. Oxford, i. xvii.

[8] For his failure to recognize the syllabic "es," the basis of Mr. Smith's opinion, may merely imply that the editor was not a scholar, perhaps only a reader at the printing-house, since the form was a deliberate archaism on Spenser's part and not an Elizabethan use. That he sometimes recognizes it is apparent in his printing "ez" in "woundez" (I. V. xlv. 4), "clothez" (I. X. xxxix. 4), and like words. Not remarking it, he sometimes fills up the syllable by conjecture, as when he gives "*Nights* drad children" (I. V. xxiii. 8) for "*Nightes* children," or "When *Titan* fayre his hot beames did display" (III. VI. vi. 5) for "When *Titan* faire his beames did display."

got" by printing "For the coole shadow thither hast'ly got."[9] Had he consulted the first quarto at all, he might have been expected to read the poet's catalogue of "Faults Escaped" with some care, the second quarto not having such a list. But without referring to the corrections given in the first edition, he printed "therefore your hardy stroke" (I. I. xii. 5); "with cruelties" (I. II. xvii. 5) instead of "with cruell spies"; and like errors. Church thought that he printed his text without ever consulting the first quarto.[10] Instances of what seem to be accidental rather than purposeful agreement support this opinion. Apart from including the additional cantos, the first folio is not a complete reprint of the second quarto, however, for it deviates to add a whole line (I. X. xx. 5) omitted in both quartos, to insert the phrase "as earst" to complete an alexandrine (III. III. 1. 9), to add a broken line, "And dearest loue," to an eight-line stanza (III. VI. xlv. 4), and to alter the reading of the second quarto at IV. XII. xiii to

> Thus whilst his stony heart was toucht with tender ruth,
> And mighty courage something mollifide.[11]

[9] Similar conjectures occur at I. VI. xxvi. 9; II. V. viii. 7, X. li. 7, XII. lii. 9; III. III. xliv. 5, VII. xlv. 1, IX. xiii. 9, XI, xxvi. 7, etc.

[10] Church, i. v.

[11] It corrects "Sir Guyon" to "Prince Arthur" (II. VIII. xlviii. 8) but leaves similar errors untouched; prefers the spelling of "Aridalian" (IV. V. v. 5) to "Acidalian" and "Cestas" (IV. V. vi. 1) to "Cestus," lections which drew comment from eighteenth century editors, for both Upton and Church report these readings in the folio and in some copies of the second quarto; emends "implements" (VI. II. xxxix. 2) to "ornaments"; and for "glee" (VI. V. xxxix. 3) substitutes the less alliterative "gree." It frequently elides vowels printed out in the quartos, giving "th' house" (II. IX lii. 9), "th' tops" (III. VII. v. 1), and "th' azure" (V. III. xix. 1), and

In brief, the editor emended as he saw fit. It is possible, however, that for certain alterations, the addition of a line or part of a line, he had a copy or copies with variants unknown to us, or a copy of the second quarto with corrections by the author. Nor is it impossible that some manuscript notes were obtained at the time the *Mutabilitie* cantos were secured.

The extent of the sale of the folio is unknown. Church thought that there was great demand for copies, and there may have been if Lownes published a large number; copies were left over, however, for some were bound with the first folio of the *Works* issued two years later. Advertised as "carefully corrected," the 1611 volume includes the *Faerie Queene* (sometimes in the text of 1609, or partly so, sometimes with the first three books dated 1611 and the last 1612 or 1613);[12] the *Shepheardes Calender* (1611); *Mother Hubberds Tale* (1612 or 1613);[13] *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (with title-page undated) together with *Astrophel*, *Thestylis*, *A Pastorall Aeglogue*, *Elegie or Friends Passion*, and two epitaphs; *Prothalamion* (1611); *Amoretti* (1611); *Epithalamion* (1611); *Fowre Hymnes* (1611); *Daphnaida* (1611); *Complaints* (1611, but with separate title-pages for the *Teares of the Muses*

avoids trisyllabic feet, printing "Come hither, hither, ô come hastily" (II. VIII. iii. 8) instead of "Come hither, come hither, ô come hastily," and "That through the sea resounding plaints did fly" (II. XII. xxvii. 4) for "That through the sea the resounding plaints did fly."

[12] At the Bodleian Copy *Mal.* 7 (1611) is bound with a 1609 *Faerie Queene* and *Douce S. 817* with the first three books of 1609 and the last dated 1613. *Copy O*. 9. 27* in the library at Cambridge University is like *Mal. 7*, and *78. g. 13* at the British Museum like *Douce S. 817*.

[13] Missing in copies which contain the 1609 printing of both parts of the *Faerie Queene*. See *Mal. 7* at the Bodleian, and *O*. 9. 27* at the library of Cambridge University.

and *Muiopotmos*); the letter to Raleigh; verses by W. R., Hobbynoll, R. S., H. B., W. L., and Ignoto; and all the other prefatory and dedicatory poems except the sonnets to Lady Carey and to "all the gratious and beautifull Ladies in the Court."[14] Although without authority, this folio is significant not only as the first edition of the "collected" works, but also as marking the first appearance of the *Shepheardes Calender* under Spenser's own name. Assured that it was less valuable than 1609 as regards the *Faerie Queene* because "farther removed from the Fountain-Head," Church was of the opinion that we are indebted to it for "some good words which are not to be met with in . . . preceding editions," perhaps suggested by Gabriel Harvey or some other intimate friend.[15] The first folio of the Works (1611-1612 or 13) is entirely dependent, however, upon the text of 1609 and characterized by tendencies peculiar to that edition: failure to recognize archaisms, further modernizations in orthography, and avoidance of trisyllabic feet.[16] That no effort had been made to go back to the earliest quartos is evident in the text of the *Shepheardes Calender*, where the folio, in printing the poet's address to his book, follows the

[14] Previously omitted in the second quarto.

[15] Church, i. v.

[16] Hence instead of "muchell" (III. VII. xxxii. 7), 1611-1612 or 13 gives "much ill"; for "gelly blood" (III. IV. xl. 6), "ielly'd blood"; for the poet's "persant" (III. IX. xx. 9) and "persent" of 1609, "present." In order to avoid a trisyllabic foot, it omits "and" in the expression "Inglorious and beastlike" (III. XI. xxiii. 2), and "to" in "And to all the rest" (III. VI. xxxix. i); finally, it alters "wise" (II. I. iv. 6), "great" (II. I. xlii. 6), "fastnesse" (V. X. xviii. 8), "robe" (V. VII. xiii. 5), to "swift," "deepe," "safenesse," "be," and omits "in vaine" (VI. III. xxiv. 5), etc. But unlike 1609, it does not elide vowels printed out in the quartos, preferring "the heauens" (VI. IX. xxviii. 6), and "the other" (V. III. xi. 7, 9), where 1609 gives "th' heavens" and "th' other."

reading of the fifth quarto rather than that of the first two quartos.[17]

Divergences in the dates of the first and second parts of the *Faerie Queene* and in *Mother Hubberds Tale* suggest that Lownes for the 1611-1612 or 13 edition printed new material as he needed it to bind with copies of the poems left over, merely prefixing new title-sheets to old versions. In 1617 he again used the material he had on hand, reprinted what he lacked, and attached a new title-page. Church, noting "the folly" of the "1617" imprint on the title-page and the date "1613" on the second part of the *Faerie Queene*, supposed that the 1611-1612 or 13 copy and the 1617 copy of the poem were "the very same." He was apparently correct, for no 1617 copy of the *Faerie Queene* has ever been identified.[18] Copy *1346 L. 1* at the British Museum with the first part of the *Faerie Queene* dated 1617 and the second 1612 is obviously as given in the previous folio; as is *C. 28. M. 7.* Some copies of 1617 appear with an undated text of *Mother Hubberds Tale* said to be "printed by H. L. and sold by G. Lathum."[19] Humphrey Lownes[20] having assigned his rights in the *Faerie Queene* to George Cole and George Lathum on November 6, 1628, the title-page to this undated text of *Mother Hubberds Tale* must have been issued not earlier than, and probably not much later than 1628,

[17] The first and second quarto read "Of noblesse and of cheualree"; the fifth quarto and the folio, "Of noblenesse and chiualrie." The third and fourth quartos read, "Of nobleness and of cheualree."

[18] See Copies *K. 4. 23* Art* at the Bodleian, *Syn. 4. 61. 40* at Cambridge University, *Grylls 32. 125* at Trinity College, Cambridge, etc. Cf. F. R. Johnson, *Bibliography* (1933), 33-48.

[19] See *Adams 4. 61. 4* at Cambridge University, and *VI. 4. 2* at Trinity College, Cambridge.

[20] Mathew Lownes had died before Oct. 3, 1625 [R. B. McKerrow, *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers . . . 1557-1640*].

evidence that copies of 1617 were being "tied up" as late as that year. Changes in the minor poems seem to be printer's errors rather than corrections of 1611, such as the alteration of "sweet" to "white" (*April*, 1. 63), "roude" to "royde" (*August*, 1. 79), and "earst" to "last" (*September*, 1. 6) in the *Shepheardes Calender*. This poem appears not under the name of the publisher but of John Harrison, who, owning the right to it, probably objected to the inclusion in 1611 under the name of Lownes. Without naming the maker of the conjecture, F. I. Carpenter reports [21] that it has been suggested that Lownes edited the first folio of the *Works* (1611). If he prepared the first folio, he must also have supervised the second printing in 1617. Nor is it unlikely, then, that he edited the *Faerie Queene* (1609).

Before the appearance of the third folio (1679), Sir James Ware published *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (1633) from a manuscript in the library of Spenser's friend, Archbishop Ussher. Although this edition of the *View* is occasionally found as a separate publication,[22] it more frequently occurs with similar treatises by Campion, Meredith Hanmer, and Henry Marleburrough, sometimes being mentioned in the title and sometimes not.[23] The editor's dedication and preface commend the discourse as showing the poet's

[21] F. I. Carpenter, *A Reference Guide to Spenser* (Chicago, 1923), 110.

[22] *Ibid.*, 111.

[23] Other selections included in the volume are: *Faerie Queene,* IV. XI. xl-xliv, "concerning the riuers of Ireland"; "out of the seventh Booke of the *Faerie Queene, Cant.* VI" (xxxvi-lv); the dedicatory sonnets to the Earl of Ormond and Ossory, Lord Grey of Wilton, and Sir John Norris; followed by a "translation made *ex tempore* by M^r *Edm. Spenser*" upon a distich written on a book belonging to the Earl of Cork, and "verses upon the said Earles Lute."

" learning and deepe judgment." Spenser's account of the language, customs, and origins is discovered to show a sound knowledge; and though he wishes some passages had been " tempered with more moderation, . . . Touching the generall scope . . . for the reformation of abuses and ill customes," none, according to Ware, had come " so neere to the best grounds for reformation, a few passages excepted," as Spenser. The editor had not intended notes till one fourth of the *View* was printed, but from that point some marginal criticisms were added.[24] Interest is attached to the annotations because of Ware's knowledge of Irish affairs and because they were the first notes to appear on any of Spenser's works after the publication of the *Shepheardes Calender* (1579).

The Latin translation of the *Calender* executed by Theodore Bathurst and edited in 1653 by Dr. William Dillingham with the Latin and English texts on opposite pages bears obvious witness that at least one editor in the seventeenth century had inspected an early quarto, for the omission of the twelfth stanza in the June eclogue from " the later Editions " is remarked in the Latin text. Though they should have been the best (because they were the last issues), the fifth quarto and the two folios had left out this stanza, which is printed not in its proper place but at the end of the volume, according to the editor's note, " as . . . sup-

[24] These are in the nature of corrections, additions, and explanatory comments. Irenaeus, for example, says that the Irish report that the Macmahons in the north were anciently English; whereupon Ware observes that by others they are held to be of the ancient Irish. When Eudoxus uses the term " cantred," the editor explains at length; and again, when reference is made to bards, he points out that Lucan alludes to them, and that both Camden and Selden give the signification of the word.

plyed . . . out of the first edition." Other first quarto readings are infrequent;[25] the English text follows the second folio of the *Works* (1617) very closely, taking over its most characteristic errors or alterations.[26] E. K.'s gloss and epistle to Harvey, and the arguments to the several eclogues are omitted, but there follows the editor's note, relative to the omission of the *June* stanza, a glossary, intended for use in reading not only the *Calender* but the other poems of Spenser. Coming soon after Davenant's observation (1650) that the poet's "obsolete language" had "grown the most vulgar accusation that is laid to his charge,"[27] this glossary is significant in that Spenser's readers in the mid-seventeenth century were perhaps having greater difficulties with his archaisms than those for whom E. K. had explained old words and hard phrases. A letter from John Hacket to Dillingham dated November 23, 1653,[28] reports that when "the time was at hand for . . . [Bathurst] to want to be ranked among the students . . . [at Trinity College, Cambridge] according to his great merits, . . . to make it quite obvious how far he excelled the whole crowd of candidates, while still very much of a youth . . . [he] laid before the master of his college this offspring of a well-trained intellect," i. e., his Latin version of the *Calender.*[29] Putting

[25] But sometimes occur, as "Ermines" (*April,* 1. 58). The glossary gives "goodlihead" (*February,* 1. 184), the lection of the first quarto, but the text reads "godlyhead."

[26] Such as "now" (*March,* 1. 18), "white" (*April,* 1. 63), "royde" (*August,* 1. 79), and "last" (*September,* 1. 6), etc. Cf. p. 8.

[27] Preface to *Gondibert, Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century,* ed. J. E. Spingarn, ii. 6.

[28] *British Museum Sloane Ms. 1710.*

[29] Hacket's letter is in Latin. Professor Tenney Frank was kind enough to furnish me with a translation by Dr. R. M. Haywood.

English texts into Latin verse was not uncommon in the seventeenth century.[30] The information in Hacket's letter and H. J. Todd's discovery of a manuscript translation of the *Calender* by John Dove, preserved at Caius College,[31] suggest that these productions were assigned as academic exercises.

The supineness of those responsible for the third folio of the *Works* (1679) is borne out by the text, but in type and general appearance this edition is an improvement over the previous folios.[32] It includes material not found in them: an engraving of the poet's tombstone with the inscription as it then read, a brief laudatory "life," Phineas Fletcher's imitation, *Brittains Ida*,[33] first published in 1628 by Thomas Walkley, who was "assured" that it was a work of Spenser's, an opinion from which the editor of the folio apparently does not dissent since he makes no comment, *A View of Ireland* with Ware's notes omitted, Bathurst's Latin version of the *Shepheardes Calender*, and an

[30] Because it was generally believed that since the English language was in a state of continual change, the writing of one age would be unintelligible to the next. Cf. preface of Sir Francis Kynaston's Latin translation (1635) of the first two books of *Troilus and Criseyde* [C. F. E. Spurgeon, *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion,* i. xxxiii]. Put in Latin, the poet was assured a lasting fame.

[31] Todd, i. xii. Cf. p. 152.

[32] The biographers of Spenser in the *DNB* state that this folio is believed to have been partly edited by Dryden. Although he was a translator rather than editor, his interest in many literary ventures, his well-known admiration for Spenser, as well as numerous emendations and corrections in his own copy of the folio now at Trinity College, Cambridge, make it not unlikely that Dryden at one time contemplated editing Spenser. It is not wholly impossible that he may have contributed the biography to the 1679 edition.

[33] The interest Fletcher's poem stimulated probably gave occasion to the binding up of further copies of the second folio and the reprinting of *Mother Hubberds Tale,* c. 1628.

abridged text of the Harvey-Spenser correspondence, subjoined as a testimonial of Spenser's "Familiarities with the most Ingenious and Learned men of those Times."[34] The negligence manifested in the preparation and the textual authority employed are nowhere better illustrated than on page 391, at the close of the volume, where having come to print the *Calendarium Pastorale* (1653), the editor discovers that he has omitted the twelfth stanza of the June eclogue, whereupon the missing lines are added with the note from the Latin text.[35] Then follows the glossary with its introductory statement as given in 1653. No greater care attended the editing of the other minor poems and the *Faerie Queene*; the text depends upon the first folio of the *Works* (1611). Continued modernizations indicate that the editor was of Fuller's opinion (1662)[36] that Spenser's book would have been more saleable had it conformed more to modern language. It must be remembered, however, that emphasis upon the adequacy of the last edition because it *was* the last was not confined to the works of Spenser;[37] and since there

[34] *The Works,* ed. 1679, A_2.

[35] Except that the words "which should have been the best" are altered to "which we now followed."

[36] *History of the Worthies of England,* repr. 1840, ii. 379. Cf. Edward Bysshe's statement that the garb of the "Good *Shakespear*" was so out of fashion that Bysshe did not quote him in the *Art of English Poetry* (1702) so frequently as he otherwise deserved (*Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion,* i. 290-291). But not everybody had difficulty in reading the Elizabethans, for Dryden considered Spenser's obsolete language a fault "but of the second magnitude." Spenser was "still intelligible, at least after a little practice" (*Essays of John Dryden,* ed. Ker. ii. 28).

[37] When the authorities of the Bodleian library secured a copy of the third folio of Shakespeare's works, they sold their copy of the first (D. N. Smith, *Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1928), 30).

were no such " cantankerous watchdogs " as Theobald, Tyrrwhit, Ritson, and others like them in the eighteenth century, no outcries were raised against the current methods of " correcting " or " bringing an earlier poet 'up-to-date.' " Not only modernizations but paraphrases of Spenser's text were in order.

Upon the supposition that his alterations could not be less acceptable to others than to himself, the anonymous author of *Spencer Redivivus* (1687) discharged Spenser's " antiquated verse and tedious Stanza "; in a word, rendered the poet what " he ought to have been instead of what " he is " to be found in himself." [38] A single extract will illustrate the quality of the paraphrase:

> A Worthy Knight was Riding on the Plain,
> In Armour Clad, which richly did Contain
> The Gallant Marks of many Battels fought,
> Tho' he before no Martial Habit sought.

Yet this, and like adaptations of Shakespeare and Milton, together with the textual methods employed in their editorial projects make clear that although they wanted knowledge of the history of the language, they had profound admiration for the greatness of the Elizabethans, which they realized could not be copied.[39]

[38] *Spencer Redivivus* (1687), A_4.

[39] John Hopkins, who, in 1699, paraphrased in rhyme the fourth, sixth, and ninth books of *Paradise Lost,* felt some distrust of his work, for he says, in his preface,

> It has been the misfortune of one of my name to affront the sacred prose of David with intolerable rhyme; and it is mine, I fear, to have abused almost as sacred verse [H. S. Pancoast, " Some Paraphrases of Milton," *Andover Review,* XV. 40].

Cf. Charles Gildon's defense (1694) of Milton's " *Antient* and consequently *less Intelligible* Words, Phrases, and *Similies* " on the grounds that they suited well with " the *Venerable Antiquity* and *Sublime Grandeur* of his Subject " [*Critical Essays of the Seventeenth*

The author of the Spenserian travesty acknowledges that, waiving the poet's language, no poetical genius since Virgil had exceeded "the wonderful Variety, Beauty, and Strength of Conception . . . found in our famous Spencer." They admired, but refashioned according to the "more polite" standards of their day.

II

Sir Kenelm Digby's *Observations on the 22. Stanza in the 9th. Canto of the 2d. Book of Spencers Faery Queene*, and his discourse, *Concerning Edmund Spencer*,[40] foreshadow the elaborately annotated editions of the eighteenth century. The *Observations* written at the request of Digby's friend, Sir Edward Stradling, with whom the author had discussed this and other difficult passages in the *Faerie Queene* while on a privateering expedition in the Mediterranean in 1628, were not published till 1643.[41] They are an explanation of a passage which had been pointed out to Digby as "an indissoluble riddle,"[42] but which he interprets according to his own mystical views in the form of an epistle to his friend. In brief, it is his opinion that Spenser intended in the ninth canto "to describe the

Century, iii. 198]. Cf. Church's remarks relative to Spenser's language, p. 105, and the objections which Dryden says were raised to modernizations of Chaucer. His own translations of this poet were not made for the use of his "old Saxon friends," who did not need them, but for those "who understand sense and poetry as well as they, when that poetry and sense is put into words which they understand" [*Essays of John Dryden*, ed. Ker, ii. 264, 266, 267].

[40] *British Museum Add. Ms. 41,846.* Transcript in *Harleian Ms. 4153, A Discourse Concerning Edmund Spencer.*

[41] Some copies are imprinted 1644.

[42] *Observations on the 22. Stanza in the 9th. Canto of the 2d. Book of Spencers Faery Queene*, 25.

bodie of a man inform'd with a rationall soul, and in prosecution of that designe," set "down particularly the severall parts of the one and of the other"; and that in stanza xxii he "comprehends the general description of them both, as (being joyned together to frame a compleat Man) they make one perfect compound"; [43] whereupon Digby gives a line by line application of this theory. Frequently reprinted in editions of the poet's works, Digby's commentary is of significance as one of the earliest attempts to interpret Spenser's text, having been written prior to the publication of Ware's annotated edition of *A View of Ireland* (1633) and printed almost a century before Jortin's *Remarks on Spenser's Poems* (1734).

The discourse was left in manuscript. Like the *Observations*, it too was written upon request, that of Thomas May, the translator of Lucan's *Pharsalia*.[44] A more general study than the *Observations*, it is chiefly concerned with Spenser's rank, learning, and language. In laudatory terms characteristic of the seventeenth century, the poet is declared so high above the reach of the critic's weak eyes that the more he looks "to discerne and descry his perfections, the more faint and dazeled they grow through the distance and splendor of the obiect." Spenser's works are evidence that a northern climate may give life to as well-tempered a brain, and to as rich a mind as where the sun shines

[43] *Ibid.*, 5.

[44] *British Museum Add. Ms. 41,846.* The manuscript was recently published in an appendix to E. W. Bligh's *Sir Kenelm Digby and His Venetia* (1932), in which Bligh notes that Digby was intimate with May about the time the two were included in Suckling's *Session of the Poets* [*Sir Kenelm Digby and His Venetia,* 220].

fairest.[45] His knowledge was the " greatest that any Poett before him euer had, excepting Virgill."

Digby's fresh and unbiased comments indicate that he understood the essential characteristics of the poet's language. Never was weight of matter better joined with majesty and sweetness of verse than by Spenser, a quality remarked by commentators later, but less often linked with Digby's third phrase, " and propriety of language." The poet " bringeth downe the highest and deepest mysteries that are contained in humane learning, to an easie and gentle forme of deliuery "; and then, as if aware how often the thought is lost in the music of the poet's stanza, Digby adds, " so cunningly " that if the reader " heede him not with great attention, rare and wonderful conceptions will unperceiued slide by him." The critic offers no Sidneyan rebuke for the poet's obsolete and archaic words but recognizes that these are a basic element in the verse, and as such worthy of much praise. Employed not out of any affectation but purposefully, they express more lively and concisely what Spenser would say.

Digby enlarges upon the significance of the poet's achievement. Were the true worth of Spenser's poetry known abroad, it would be an inducement to the best wits and most learned men to study the long-neglected English language. He hopes that Spenser's works will be a means whereby the language may remain and continue in the form it now has, retention in its present

[45] As a result of the scientific movement, the influence of climate was a point of frequent discussion in the seventeenth century. Eighteenth-century scholars showed no less interest in the subject. Cf. Joseph Warton's statement that " we can never completely relish, or adequately understand any author . . . except we constantly keep in our eye his climate, his country and his age " [*An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope,* second edition (1762), 5].

perfectness being advocated to the advantage of future poets in imitating the excellencies of their predecessors. Like most academicians, Digby has no fear that fixation will stifle the language. He is confident that not any fate or length of time will alter it as it is now used out of Spenser's school, only some " generall innouation . . . that may shake as well the foundations " of the nation. His exception is prophetic in view of the change which was completed a few years later. Ironically enough, this change, which introduced criteria so little conducive to the admiration of Spenser's " grandam words," was in great part stimulated by Jonson, who, Digby predicted, would " build up that worke whose foundations " Spenser " so fairely layed." William Bosworth reminds us that Digby often called Spenser the English Virgil.[46] Upon laying the discourse aside, one is assured that when he read, Digby felt " a strange fulness and roundess " in the poet's words.

III

The third folio of the *Works* (1679) was the first collected edition to contain a biography of Spenser; scholars had, however, begun to record brief accounts long before 1679. Among the first were Camden, the Scottish historian Robert Johnston, and Sir James Ware, who had published *A View of Ireland*. It is not unfitting that Camden should have been the earliest, for Spenser had commended him in the *Ruines of Time* as one whose just labors should endure " though time all moniments obscure."

[46] *Arcadius and Sepha,* ed. 1651, A_4 verso.

Both in his *Britannia* (1600) [47] and *Remains Concerning Britain* (1605),[48] the antiquary mentions the poet, but his fullest accounts occur in *Reges, Reginae, Nobiles, et Alii in Ecclesia Collegiata B. Petri Westmonasterii Sepulti* (1600) and *Annales Rerum Anglicanarum et Hibernicarum regnante Elizabetha* (1615). In the earlier work, he says of Spenser,

> Londinensis, Anglicorum Poetarum nostri seculi facilè princeps, quod eius poemata fauentibus Musis & victuro genio conscripta comprobant. Obijt immatura morte anno salutis 1598. & prope Galfredum Chaucerum conditur qui foelicissimè poesin Anglicis literis primus illustrauit.[49]

The frequently quoted epitaphs beginning " Hic prope Chaucerum," etc., follow. In his *Annales* [50] of the reign of Elizabeth, he relates that Spenser, a native of London and scholar at Cambridge, was born under so favorable an aspect of the muses that he surpassed all the English poets of former times, " ne Chaucero quidem conciue excepto," but by a fate common to poets had always " cum paupertate conflictatus," though he had been secretary to Lord Grey. Scarcely had he settled himself in Ireland with leisure to write, when he was thrown out of his dwelling and plundered of his

[47] Speaking of those buried in Westminster, Camden mentions Chaucer, and

> qui ad illum ingenii faecilitate, & diuite Poëseos vena proximè inter Anglicos poëtas accessit Edm. Spencerus [*Britannia* (1600), 5th ed., 379].

[48] Spenser is compared to Lucan and placed among " other most pregnant witts of these our times, whom succeeding ages may iustly admire " [*Remains* (1605), " Poems," p. 8].

[49] *Reges, Reginae, Nobiles, et Alii in Ecclesia . . . Westmonasterii Sepulti* (1600), sig. I_2 verso.

[50] *Annales Rerum Anglicanarum et Hibernicarum regnante Elizabetha* (1615), 171.

goods by rebels, in Camden's words, " cum à rebellibus è laribus eiectus et bonis spoliatus." He returned to England where he died " inops " and was interred in Westminster, near Chaucer, at the charge of the Earl of Essex,

> Poetis funus ducentibus, flebilibus carminibus et calamis in tumulum conjectis.

In *Historia Rerum Britannicarum* (1655), under the date of 1598, Johnston records the facts as given in Camden's *Annales* with the additional detail that Spenser inveighed against Burleigh in *Mother Hubberds Tale*.[51]

Prior to the publication of Johnston's history, Sir James Ware had written two lives: a brief but significant sketch in the preface to his edition of *A View of Ireland*, and a second account in 1639 in *De Scriptoribus Hiberniae*. The earlier is important as the source of that tantalizing story of the lost books of the *Faerie Queene*, the later part of which is said to have been finished in Ireland, but soon after unfortunately lost by the disorder and abuse of Spenser's servant, whom he had sent before him into England. It is not improbable that Camden's " bonis spoliatus " includes lost manuscripts. Certainly, John Stradling had them in mind in his epigram (1607) to " Edm. Spencer eximium poëtam, de exemplaribus suis quibusdam manuscriptis, ab Hibernicis exlegibus igne crematis, in Hibernica defectione,"

> Ingenij tantum noram tibi flumen, vt ipsum
> Absumi flammis non potuisse putem.
> Flumen at ingenij partim tibi sorbuit ignis:

[51] *Historia Rerum Britannicarum* (Amsterdam, 1655), 249.

> Qualis, qui flumen devoret, ignis erat?
> Sylvestris populus sylvestres injicit ignes:
> Talibus obsistunt flumina nulla pyris.[52]

Ware's intimate acquaintanceship with Irish affairs strengthens the authenticity of this detail, the most interesting told in the early years following the poet's death. Several facts in this earlier biography (1633) are notable. These are: that Spenser was born of an ancient and noble family; that at Cambridge he did not misspend his time, as manifested in his later work; that he accompanied Lord Grey to Ireland, and for his services to the crown was rewarded with 3000 acres of land in the County of Cork; and, that he died in 1599, and not as "others have it wrongly 1598." In the second account (1639) Spenser is acclaimed "Poetarum Anglorum suae aetatis princeps" and is said to have contemplated a treatise on the antiquities of Ireland.[53]

The two decades after 1633 were marked by turbulent political changes which reacted unhappily upon literary pursuits and achievements in general. There was no re-issue of Spenser's *Works*, and no biography of the poet till the appearance of Fuller's *History of the Worthies of England* in 1662. But that scholars had continued to be concerned about Spenser's work and were searching for his manuscript remains in both England and Ireland is evident from the letters exchanged between Dr. John Worthington, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, and Milton's friend, Samuel Hartlib. On January 1, 1660, Hartlib wrote Worthington that he longed to have his "promises" about the re-

[52] *Epigrammatum Libri quatuor* (London, 1607), iii. 100. Cf. Carpenter, 127, and Todd, i. cxx.

[53] *De Scriptoribus Hiberniae*, ed. 1639, II. v. 137.

nowned Spenser, and said that he would very willingly search for the poet's work both in Ireland and England.[54] On January 11, Worthington noticed the want of the last six books of the *Faerie Queene* and catalogued the works of Spenser which had been mentioned but not printed.[55] Intimations that "divers . . . poems were disperst abroad in sundry hands," some purloined from the poet after he went to Ireland, encouraged the doctor to believe that if not quite lost, these poems might perhaps be hidden in libraries in northern England or Kent. Besides the lost books of the major poem, he himself desired most to see "the English Poet, and the Divine Poems: for that in his latter years . . . [the poet] most relish'd the more divine strain of poesie by several passages in his printed poems."[56] Hartlib assured his correspondent on January 15, that he would inquire diligently after Spenser's works and advise him the result of his efforts.[57] On March 13, he notes that he had already written to Ireland. Time passed and nothing more was said about the investigation till December 2, 1661 when Worthington wrote that he supposed Hartlib's silence indicated an unsatisfactory answer to his request.[58] Hartlib replied that he had received no answer from Ireland, but that he would write once more.[59] That was on December 7, 1661. In a letter dated February 14, 1662, Hartlib mentions his continual bodily pains and prognosticates that he will not be able to write again. Whether or not sickness prevented his further search is not known; he may have lived till 1670;[60] but if Hartlib's search was discon-

[54] John Worthington, *Diary and Correspondence* (Chetham Soc., 1847-86), i. 259.
[55] *Ibid.*, i. 261.
[56] *Ibid.*, i. 263.
[57] *Ibid.*, i. 271.
[58] *Ibid.*, ii. i. 76.
[59] *Ibid.*, ii. i. 86.
[60] *DNB*, article "Hartlib."

tinued at a time not distant from February, 1662, a letter from Worthington to Henry More, the Cambridge Platonist and Spenserian imitator, discloses that Worthington had not forgotten their poet.[61] It is regrettable not to know of whom Hartlib inquired for the manuscripts,[62] and whether he ever discussed the investigation with his old friend, John Milton, who addressed a treatise on education to him, and who had owned Spenser as one of his great teachers.

Thomas Fuller in *A History of the Worthies of England* (1662) [63] recounts that

> Edmond Spencer . . . was brought up in Pembroke-hall . . . where he became an excellent scholar; but especially most happy in English poetry, as his works do declare; in which the many *Chaucerisms* used (for I will not say affected by him) are thought by the ignorant to be blemishes, known by the learned to be beauties, to his book.

Then follows the previously quoted observation as to the effect of the " Chaucerisms " on the sale of the poet's book, whereupon the author prints the first biographical version of the " reason-rime " story.[64] The considerable

[61] He refers to Bathurst's Virgilian translation of the *Shepheardes Calender*. The letter is dated November 4, 1670 [II. ii. 345].

[62] In the course of the correspondence, Hartlib mentions numerous acquaintances in Ireland: Robert Boyle; his sister, the Viscountess Ranelagh; Captain Shane, " an Irish gentleman "; and others. During the week of June 7, 1659, he was surprised with a visit from " Dr. Jones, the Vice-chancellor of Dublin " [I. 134]. On October 30, 1661, he had received " a lettter from Ireland from Mr. Robert Wood, another cordial friend " [II. i. 72]. A diligent search has not, however, revealed further letters relative to Spenserian manuscripts.

[63] In alluding to Chaucer's tomb, Fuller earlier had said, " Chaucer since hath got the company of Spenser and Drayton, a pair royal of poets, enough almost to make passengers' feet to move metrically, who go over the place where so much poetical dust is interred " [*The Church History of Britain* (1655), ed. 1842, i. iv. 469].

[64] The first record of this story, however, appears in John Manningham's *Diary* (Jan. 1601-2—April 1603) [Camden Soc., 1868], 43.

attention given this anecdote by later biographers justifies quoting almost the whole of it. Fuller says,

> There passeth a story commonly told and believed, that Spenser presenting his poems to queen Elizabeth, she, highly affected therewith, commanded the lord Cecil, her treasurer, to give him a hundred pounds; and when the treasurer (a good steward of the queen's money) alleged that sum was too much; "Then give him," quoth the queen, "what is reason;" to which the lord consented; but was so busied, belike, about matters of higher concernment, that Spenser received no reward; whereupon he presented this petition in a small piece of paper to the queen in her progress:
>
> "I was promis'd on a time,
> To have reason for my rhyme;
> From that time unto this season,
> I· receiv'd nor rhyme nor reason."

The queen is said to have given then "strict order (not without some check to her treasurer) for the present payment of the hundred pounds she first intended unto him." [65] The poet's office under Lord Grey was "lucrative, yet got he no estate," and died "for grief in great want, anno 1598." His date for the poet's death and his failure to mention the lost books of the *Faerie Queene* and the grant of Spenser's Irish estate, point to Fuller's dependence upon Camden's account to the neglect of Ware's. He concludes with the facts of the poet's funeral and burial, but omits Camden's report that the funeral was attended by noblemen and poets who threw into the open grave elegies with the pens that wrote them.

Sir James Ware's story of the "lost" books and the "reason-rime" tale, both of which may have basis

[65] *History of the Worthies of England*, repr. 1840, ii. 379.

in fact, suggest that in order to satisfy the popular curiosity about the increasingly fascinating figure of the poet a crop of anecdotes was springing up. John Aubrey, the next biographer (1669-1696), adds to the list stories of more doubtful authenticity. On the authority of William Beeston, who knew all the old English poets,[66] he describes the poet as "a little man," who "wore short haire, little band and little cuffs."[67] Spenser unsuccessfully competed with Bishop Andrews for a fellowship at Cambridge, a fact later disproved;[68] he was an acquaintance and frequenter of Sir Erasmus Dryden, and his mistress Rosalind was a kinswoman of Sir Erasmus's lady. On the authority of John Dryden, a room at his grandfather's was called "Mr. Spencer's chamber." When the wainscot of this room was removed, there was "found an abundance of cards, with the stanzas of the 'Faerie Queen' written on them."[69] Samuel Woodford was Aubrey's source for the report that Spenser had lived sometime in Hampshire, where in that "delicate sweet ayre . . . he enjoyed his muse, and writt good part of his verses." Sidney and Raleigh are mentioned as Spenser's friends, and Archbishop Ussher is named as an acquaintance.[70] Elsewhere remarking Sidney's munificence of spirit, Aubrey describes the supposed first meeting between Sidney and Spenser:

[66] John Aubrey, *Brief Lives* (1669-1696), ed. Clark, i. 96.
[67] *Ibid.*, ii. 233.
[68] Cf. p. 69.
[69] Aubrey, ii. 232.
[70] By Sir John Denham, who related to Aubrey the archbishop's often quoted remark on the appearance of Davenant's preface to *Gondibert*, "Out upon him, with his vaunting preface, he speakes against my old friend, Edmund Spenser" (ii. 233).

Sir Philip was busy at his study, and his servant delivered Mr. Spencer's booke to his master, who layd it by, thinking it might be such kind of stuffe as he was frequently troubled with. Mr. Spencer stayd so long that his patience was wearied, and went his way discontented, and never intended to come again. When Sir Philip perused it, he was so exceedingly delighted with it, that he was extremely sorry he was gonne, and where to send for him he knew not. After much enquiry he learned his lodgeing, and sent for him, mightily caressed [him], and ordered his servant to give him . . . pounds in gold. His servant sayd that that was too much; 'No,' said Sir Philip, 'he is . . . ,' and ordered an addition. From this time there was a great friendship between them, to his dying day.[71]

Gossipy and unfounded as Aubrey's anecdotes are, two of them, the story of the fellowship and this meeting with Sidney, caught the eye of numerous biographers and were many times retold, with evidence for or against their authenticity.

The possibility of Milton's having influenced the account given in Edward Phillips's *Theatrum Poetarum Anglicanorum* (1675) enhances its value. Here the poet is declared "the first of our *English* Poets that brought Heroic Poesie to any perfection, his *Faery Queen* being for great Invention and Poetic heighth judg'd little inferiour, if not equal to the chief of the ancient Greeks and Latins or Modern *Italians*,"—commendation comparable to any Elizabethan tribute paid the poet, and of unusual significance because it is praise for Spenser in the Battle of the Books. The *Shepheardes Calender* so endeared him to Sidney that he made the poet known to the queen and by that means secured for him the secretaryship to Sir Henry Sidney in Ire-

[71] Aubrey, ii. 248-249.

land.[72] There the poet wrote his *Faerie Queene*, but upon Sidney's return to England and the poet's consequent loss of employment, Spenser returned also, and, having lost his friend Sir Philip, fell into poverty. He appealed to the queen, whose bounty was "nevertheless . . . abridg'd to 100 [£] by *Cecil*, who hearing of it, and owing him a grudge for some reflections in Mother *Hubbards* Tale, cry'd out to the Queen, What, all this for a Song?" This treatment so affected the poet that he contracted a deep melancholy, which soon ended his life. Phillips says nothing of the poet's Chaucerisms or obsolete language, but in the preface to his work particularly commends the Spenserian stanza, which he thought if revived would soon be acknowledged superior to the couplet or alternation of four verses.[73] His biographical facts are inaccurate and inadequate, but Phillips's high commendation of the poet, added to the exalted praise found four years later in the folio of 1679, appears all the more remarkable, coming at a time when poetry was being designed according to rhythmic patterns totally dissimilar to Spenser's.

William Winstanley's life (1684) appeared after the date of the last folio (1679), but because it is so largely indebted to Fuller's biography should be considered before the account in the folio. Winstanley reprints Fuller's remarks concerning the poet's Chaucerisms and poverty, retells the reason-rime story, comments briefly on the poems, quotes Sidney's criticism of the *Shepheardes Calender*, notes Spenser's translation of *The Gnat*, "a little fragment of *Virgil's* excellency";[74] his

[72] Phillips says to "his brother, Sir Henry Sidney." The editor, who reprinted Phillips in 1800, corrects to "father." Cf. p. 154.

[73] *Theatrum Poetarum Anglicanorum* (1675), **3 verso—**4.

[74] *Lives of the Most Famous English Poets*, ed. 1687, 89.

Ruines of Rome; and his "most unfortunate Work," *Mother Hubberds Tale*, which gave "offence to one in authority, who afterwards stuck on his skirts"; and concludes that envy itself could not carp at the poet's *Faerie Queene*, a work that will last as long as time.

According to "A Summary of the Life of Mr. Edmond Spencer" in the last folio (1679), the poet was born in London in 1510, "as his *Epitaph* says," [75] attended Pembroke College, Cambridge, unsuccessfully competed for a scholarship, afterwards visited friends in the North, fell in love, and, at last, upon the insistence of his friends, came to London. There his fame in the art of poetry was the means of his meeting those similarly inclined, who might aid and encourage him. The biographer recounts the story of the meeting between Sidney and the poet told in Aubrey's life but with elaborate additions and variations. He relates that Spenser

took an occasion to go one morning to *Leicester-House*, furnish't only with a modest confidence, and the Ninth *Canto* of the First Book of his *Faëry Queen*: He waited not long, e're he found the lucky season for an address of the Paper to his hand; who having read the Twenty-eighth *Stanza of Despair*, (with some signs of his Countenance of being much affected, and surpris'd with what he had read) turns suddenly to his Servant, and commands him to give the Party that presented the Verses to him Fifty Pounds; the Steward stood speechless, and unready, till his Master having past over another *Stanza*, bad him give him an Hundred Pound; the Servant something stagger'd at the humor his Master was in, mutter'd to this purpose, That by the semblance of the Man that brought the Paper, Five Pounds would be a proper Reward; but Mr. *Sidney* having read the following *Stanza*, commands him to

[75] *The Works*, ed. 1679, A.

give Two Hundred Pounds, and that very speedily, least advancing his Reward, proportionably to the heigth of his Pleasure in reading, he should hold himself oblig'd to give him more than he had: Withal he sent an invitation to the Poet, to see him at those hours, in which he would be most at leasure.

Thereafter, Sidney became not only the poet's patron but friend, entered him at court, and obtained a pension for him as poet laureate. The pension was discontinued after a short time by a great counselor, who studied the queen's profit more than her diversion. The biographer notes that the poet's resentment appears both in *Teares of the Muses* and *Mother Hubberds Tale*. Yet Spenser was not without the esteem and favor of many of the nobility, whom he celebrated in his verses. A grant of land bestowed upon him for his services to the crown included his house in Kilcolman with " the River *Mulla*, so often celebrated by him, running through his Grounds." Disasters forced him to return to England, where he died " without the help of any other Disease save a broken Heart," and was buried in Westminster, near Chaucer and at the expense of the Earl of Essex, in 1596. The account records that the Court of Claims restored to Hugolin Spenser, the poet's great-grandchild,[76] all the lands discovered to have been his ancestor's. It reports that the remainder of Spenser's works were " embezill'd when he was in *Ireland*," for besides the works given in the folio, many other excellent writings valued by his friends were either lost or concealed in private hands. Among these are mentioned the *Nine Comedies*, so much esteemed by Harvey, *The Canticles* paraphrased, *The Ecclesiastes*,

[76] *Ibid.*, A verso. H. J. Todd corrects to " grandson " [i. cxlvi]. Cf. p. 156.

Hours of Our Lord, *Seven Psalms*, *The Dying Pelican*, *The Sacrifice of a Sinner*, *Stemmata Dudleiana*, *Purgatory*, *A Sennight's Slumber*, *Epithalamion Thamesis*, and *The Hell of Lovers*. The biography concludes with a splendid tribute: Spenser was

> a man of extraordinary Accomplishments, excellently skill'd in all parts of Learning: of a profound Wit, copious Invention, and solid Judgment: of a temper strangely tender, and amorous; as appears every where in his Writings.

He excelled all other ancient and modern poets, in greatness of sense, decency of expression, height of imagination, quickness of conceit, grandeur and majesty of thought, and all the glories of verse. His descriptions are " so easie and natural, that his Pen seems to have a power of conveying *Idea's* to our mind, more just, and to the Life, than the exquisite Pencils of *Titian*, or *Raphael*, to our eyes."

At the close of the seventeenth century the generally accepted biographical facts were these: the poet was born in London; was educated at Cambridge; fell in love with " Rosalind " of the *Calender*; accompanied Lord Grey as secretary to Ireland; was rewarded for his services to the crown by a grant of 3000 acres of land in the county of Cork, with " the River *Mulla* . . . running through his Grounds "; was afterwards " à rebellibus è laribus eiectus et bonis spoliatus "; returned " inops " to England, where he died (as some say, according to Camden, 1598, and others, according to Ware, 1599); and was buried, at the charge of the Earl of Essex, near Chaucer in Westminster Abbey. Among the anecdotes accumulated in this period, Sir James Ware's account of the lost books of the *Faerie Queene*, the reason-rime tale, Aubrey's version of the

first meeting between Sidney and Spenser, and the report of the poet's competition for a university fellowship were the most frequently retold in the following century. However many difficulties his "Chaucerisms" caused some of his editors and readers, the high commendation found in the biographies of Phillips and the folio of 1679 is proof of the esteem in which he was held by certain judicious-minded persons. Contemporary praise could hardly have been more enthusiastic than the concluding sentence of the account of 1679:

> He was, in a word, compleatly happy in every thing that might render him Glorious, and Inimitable to future Ages.

CHAPTER TWO

JOHN HUGHES

CHAPTER TWO

JOHN HUGHES

The folio of the *Faerie Queene* and the three folios of Spenser's *Works* printed during the seventeenth century were typical publishers' volumes prepared with a view to sale rather than to scholarly care. As indicated in the foregoing chapter, each was reprinted from its predecessor with continued degeneration of the text and no recourse to the earliest quartos, a first quarto having been consulted only in the instance of the English text printed with Bathurst's Latin *Calender* (1653). During the first half of the eighteenth century priority was given to the first folio of the *Works* (1611), but out-of-print quartos were infrequently referred to; the folio size in printing yielded to smaller editions; and the name of an editor appeared on the title-page of his publication. There were some thirty-six years, however, between the last folio and the first edition published in the eighteenth century.

Edited by John Hughes, a minor poet of note, this edition was printed for Jacob Tonson in 1715.[1] Its six duodecimo volumes include the poems and prose given in the last folio, but with *A Pastorall Aeglogue*, *An Elegie or Friends Passion*, and the two epitaphs on Sidney ascribed to different hands. It also expresses

[1] Two printings were made: a "large paper" with a list of the subscribers, including the names of Addison, Prior, Pope, and Walpole, and a "smaller" without the list. These differ, as in the text of the *Faerie Queene,* III. I. ii. 4 and iv. 6, where the one reads "her to" and "it those" and the other, "to her" and "it to those," alterations probably ascribable to the printer. See Ray Heffner, "The Printing of John Hughes' Edition of Spenser," *MLN*, L. 151-153.

doubt as to the authenticity of *Brittains Ida.*[2] *An Essay on Allegorical Poetry, Remarks on the Fairy Queen, Remarks on the Shepherd's Calendar* and other *Writings of Spenser*, a biography of the poet, a glossary, and a few words concerning the edition enrich the first volume. The treatment of the text and the criticism in the prefatory essays are of chief interest.

" An Editor of the Works of a dead Author," Hughes says, " ought to consider himself as a kind of Executor of his Will," which he should " endeavour to perform with the same Care, and, in every Circumstance, after the same manner he believes the Author himself wou'd have done, if living." [3] Hence, like nearly every editor in his age,[4] Hughes felt free to alter text. The poet's orthography was " irregular," the same word often being written differently, sometimes for the sake of the rhyme, perhaps only to make it more exact to the eye of the reader; to Hughes this was so absurd a procedure that he preferred the old spelling only for the most part. Yet, he considered his semblance of accuracy an innovation, and apprehensive of adverse critical opinions, because he had not made further alterations, defended his limited use of the poet's language.[5] To

[2] *The Works of Edmund Spenser,* ed. Hughes, i. cx.

[3] *Ibid.*, i. (iii).

[4] Cf. Rowe, Pope, etc. Hughes participated in the reprint of Rowe's *Shakespeare* in 1714 [*Isaac Reed's Variorum Edition of Shakespeare* (1803), ii. 149]. Cf. Bentley, who suppressed about seventy passages of *Paradise Lost* (1732), because he supposed that nearly all of them were the work of an editor who interfered with Milton's original [Ants Oras, *Milton's Editors and Commentators from Patrick Hume to Henry John Todd* (Estonia: University of Tartu [Dorpat]; London: Oxford University Press, 1931), 70].

[5] As late as 1765, Bishop Percy looked on his text of the ballads as a young woman from the country with unkempt locks, whom he had to fit for fashionable society. When Joseph Ritson objected to his ruthless alterations, the reviews and friends of the Bishop abused

follow the poet's spelling " for the most part " might be thought by some " too strict and precise," but it was necessary not only to show the true state of the language as Spenser wrote it, but to keep the " exact Sense, which wou'd sometimes be chang'd by the Variation of a Syllable or a Letter." [6] Baroque representations of Louis Quatorze architecture, Roman toga, and Greek temple which illustrate the edition indicate how little neo-classical criteria harmonized with the spirit of Spenser's poetry and make more intelligible this defense.

The direction of Hughes's alterations was towards a modern uniformity; thus where the second quarto and all the folios read " food " and " feood " (IV. I. xxvi. 2, 4), Hughes gives " Food " and " Feud." His fondness for capitalization is observable in these lections.[7] How much the editor influenced the spelling and capitalization would be difficult to tell; probably little, however, for standards in such matters continued to be set at the printing-house. His text was advertised as " carefully corrected by a Collation of all " former issues,[8] but Hughes did not transcend tradition. He had seen a copy of the first quarto of the *Faerie Queene*, for he printed both conclusions of the third book; he certainly saw the last folio of the *Works* (1679); and a 1609 folio of the *Faerie Queene*; or more likely the first folio of the *Works* (1611) bound with the first part of the poem according to 1609 and the second part as

Ritson [*Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript,* ed. Hales and Furnivall, i. xvi].

[6] Hughes, i. cxi.

[7] A characteristic common to innumerable works in the period.

[8] *The Daily Courant* for August 22, 1715. Even inadequate collations indicate that the scientific movement of the seventeenth century was beginning to affect textual criticism. Cf. Jortin, p. 58, the reprint of Hughes's edition, p. 61, and Birch's *Faerie Queene* (1751), p. 65.

given in 1612-13, for in the first three books Hughes apparently followed 1609 where it differs from later folios and in the last books seems to have preferred the text of 1612-13.[9] He avoids errors in the minor poems characteristic of 1617,[10] but looked into some early quartos of these poems.[11]

Johnson said that Hughes "perhaps wanted an antiquary's knowledge" of Spenser's obsolete words.[12] Hughes's treatment of "gan," which he is careful to print "'gan," regardless of his authority, and always interpret "began,"[13] his acceptance of "fits" for "sits" (I. I. xxx. 9, etc.), and "renowned" for "renowmed" (I. V. v. 1, etc.), and his alteration of "wonned" to "wonted" (*Shepheardes Calender*, February, 119), and "assott" to "a Sot" (*Shepheardes Calender, March*, 1. 25), support Johnson's statement.[14]

[9] See n. 16, p. 6. [10] See p. 8.

[11] At any rate, in the *Shepheardes Calender,* he corrects "gusts" and "dead" of the October eclogue (1. 39, 65), and "Yore" of the February (1. 230), lections of the folios and the text given in the Latin *Calender,* to "Giusts" (first quarto, "giusts"), "dread" (first quarto reads "dreade") and "For" (first three quartos); in line 228 of the February eclogue, he more happily replaces the word "seene" (as "seen"), which had been omitted in all editions from the fifth quarto. An additional and less obvious word, "seene," would have been a difficult conjecture.

[12] *Lives of the Poets,* ed. Hill, ii. 162. Johnson's own knowledge of the old words was not extensive.

[13] See I. II. ii. 3; II. VI. xxxix. 3, VIII. viii. 8, ix. 6; III. VIII, xlviii. 2, etc., in only the first of which readings the last folio and Hughes use the apostrophe, and in all others Hughes alone.

[14] He notes in his glossary that "glitterand" is a participle used by Chaucer and the old poets, yet he prints "Glitter and Armour" (I. VII. xxix. 4), "Glitter and Light" (I. IV. xvi. 9), and "Glitter and Arms" (II. VII. xlii. 1), correcting the last, however, in his errata. He omitted E. K.'s gloss, altered the "Arguments" to the *Calender,* and not having inspected with any care a text of the *Faerie Queene* earlier than 1609, neglected "Faults Escaped" of the first quarto (1590).

Yet Hughes sometimes attempted to rectify an error corrected by the poet without consulting Spenser's errata, as at I. I. xii. 5, where he omitted " and " instead of " hardy." He detected the absence of an " embleme " for the December eclogue in the *Calender* and supplied one himself, corrected the error in the Argument to VI. V., by changing " Matilda " to " Serena " and rightly substituted " Calepine " for " Calidore " (VI. VI. xvii. 7).[15] His antiquarian inadequacies and deference to current taste by no means made him insensible to the excellencies of Spenser's diction, which he commends as " for the most part, strong, significant and harmonious," and " much more sublime and beautiful than that of any *English* Poet, who had written before him." [16] Nor does Hughes's imperfect glossary [17] necessarily indicate eighteenth-century ignorance of Spenser, although it contains explanations of such simple words as " aghast," " baleful," " carol," " behest," etc., all of which appear in the glossaries of the best modern one-volume editions of the poet.[18] Rather it is a sign that scholars were then applying to English poets the same care and elaboration they had devoted to editing the classics. Todd was almost justified in accusing Hughes of reducing the text to " modern orthography." [19] Yet, de-

[15] He printed " eft " for " oft " (IV. VII. xxxii. 7) to improve the rhyme, conjectured " them " for " him " (IV. IX. xi. 9), Church says, without any authority though it appears to be the true reading [iii. 436], and " cleanest " for " clearest " (VI. XII. xli. 3), which, J. C. Smith says, " though not supported by any of the old copies examined, is nevertheless very probably right " [ii. 518].

[16] Hughes, i. cxiii. Spenser's old words are of " mix'd Derivation, from the *Latin, Saxon, Runick, French* and *German* Languages "; many are from Chaucer [i. cxii].

[17] Thomas Edwards's letter to John Clerke dated April 27, 1744, *Bodl. Ms. 1010.*

[18] Oxford, Globe, and Cambridge.

[19] Todd, i. A_3 verso.

spite Hughes's slender acquaintance with the history of the language, his regard for contemporary taste, and the lack of thoroughness in his collations, he had some notion of what should be done. If not accurate according to modern standards, he was an unusually resourceful editor, and for his day, capable.

In a period unfamiliar with Elizabethan literary ideals, Hughes's commentaries approximated truth. Recognizing the futility of judging the *Faerie Queene* as an epic, he set up a new standard,[20] and by way of remarking the chivalric influences in the poet's age, initiated the historical method in Spenserian scholarship.[21] How happily he understood the allegorical genre is evident when he declares it,

> the *Fairy Land* of Poetry, peopled by Imagination; its Inhabitants . . . so many Apparitions; its Woods, Caves, wild Beasts, Rivers, Mountains and Palaces, . . . all visionary and

[20] Cf. *Paradise Lost,* which was being justified on the grounds that it was not an epic (and therefore not to be judged by the rules of the epic), but a divine poem. See n. 28, p. 41.

[21] Hughes was apparently influenced by Dryden in his use of the historical method, as well as in his criticism of the "fairy kind of writing," and his discussion of the plan and historical allegory of the *Faerie Queene* [see n. 27, p. 40, and n. 44, p. 46; p. 44]. Cf. Blackmore's review of the rise and popularity of romantic literature (1716): "At length after the Irruptions of the *Goths* and *Vandals* had broke the Power of the *Roman* Empire, . . . the Learning of *Greece* and *Rome* . . . was intirely effac'd by the Rudeness and Barbarity of the *Northern* Conquerors." But a new way of writing took possession of the world after the restoration of the exiled learning; "all *Europe* on a sudden saw itself chang'd into *Fairy-Land* . . . hence it came to pass, that there is so great a Mixture of Knight-Errantry, Sorcery, and incredible Atchievements in the Poems of *Ariosto, Tasso,* and our famous *Spenser*; who, notwithstanding they had the Precepts of *Aristotle* and *Horace,* and the Examples of *Homer* and *Virgil* back'd with Reason to direct their Conduct, . . . accommodated their Writings to the prevailing Opinion" [*Essays upon Several Subjects* (London, 1716), i. 30-33]. Cf. Warton, p. 116.

typical . . . [abounding] in such Licences as wou'd be shocking and monstrous, if the Mind did not attend to the mystick Sense contain'd under them.[22]

The form is discovered to be of two kinds: that "in which the Story is fram'd of real or historical Persons, and probable or possible Actions," such as the *Aeneid*, which the critic's age interpreted as history reconstructed to bolster a political and moral idea; and that "in which the Fable or Story consists for the most part of fictitious Persons or Beings, Creatures of the Poet's Brain, and Actions surprizing, and without the Bounds of Probability or Nature," such as the story of Circe in the *Odyssey*.[23] The first being more of a parallel than an allegory, Hughes is concerned with the second, which "for the sake of the moral Sense couch'd under its Fictions" not only gives speech to brutes and introduces goblins, faeries, and the like, but "frequently gives Life to Virtues and Vices, Passions and Diseases, . . . natural and moral Qualities," and represents them "acting as divine, human, or infernal Persons."[24] Every book of the *Faerie Queene* being "fruitful of these visionary Beings,"[25] the editor abandoned neo-

[22] Hughes, i. xxxiv.

[23] *Ibid.*, i. xxxv-xxxvii.

[24] *Ibid.*, i. xl-xli. Hughes cites the well-known example of Æsop's *Fables* [i. xxxiv].

[25] Like Addison, Hughes objects to the introduction of these "shadowy Beings" in "just Epick Poems"; because they belong to an imaginary life, they are to be excluded from any share in the action of an epic, one property of which was probability. Nor are they appropriate in drama, despite their appearance on the ancient stage. They are properly admitted, however, in poems designed to be allegorical. Such characters are Milton's Sin and Death, which develop one of the most beautiful allegories in the language, and similar figures in the sixth book of the *Aeneid*. The latter appear, but have no share in the action of the epic [i. xli, xliii, xxx]. Cf. Newton's

classical tradition, which had examined the poem by "the Rules of Epick Poetry, as . . . drawn from the Practice of *Homer* and *Virgil*," [26] to declare it a "Poem of a particular kind, describing in a Series of Allegorical Adventures or Episodes the most noted Virtues and Vices." [27] That he had caught the real cast and color

defense (1749) of Milton's allegorical figures on the authority that such fictitious beings occurred in ancient poetry; that, since nearly all the events in *Paradise Lost* take place in an invisible world, these figures may properly have place there; and that the characters of Sin and Death are agreeable to the hints and sketches given of them in the Bible [*Milton's Editors and Commentators,* 228, 247-248].

[26] Hughes, i. lx. Here as often in the eighteenth century scholarship and criticism overlap. Hughes turns critic with ideas contrary to current opinion. Cf. Rymer's "besides *Homer* and *Virgil* . . . [Spenser] had read *Tasso,* yet he rather suffer'd himself to be misled by *Ariosto* . . . he makes no conscience of Probability" [Preface to Rapin (1674)]; Dryden's "Spenser wanted only to have read the rules of Bossu" [*Dedication to the Aeneis* (1697)]; and Dennis's that Spenser by not following the rules fell "very far short of the Ancients" [*The Grounds of Criticism* (1704), a_6].

[27] Hughes was, of course, aware of the poet's own classification; it is not unlikely, however, that Addison and Steele suggested his Spenserian project and perhaps influenced his interpretation of the *Faerie Queene.* Steele urged his colleague on November 19, 1712, to attempt an "Encomium of Spenser," or at least to indulge his own "Passion for that charming Author so far as to print the loose Hints" he was then offering "on that Subject" [*The Spectator,* No. 540]. By 1713 Addison had recanted an earlier opinion [*Epistle to Sacheverel* (1694)] to point to the poet as the last writer of note who had applied himself to the allegorical form with success [*The Guardian,* September 4]. In No. 419 of the *Spectator* he alludes to "another sort of imaginary Beings" met "with among the Poets, when the Author represents any Passion, Appetite, Virtue or Vice, under a visible Shape and makes it a Person or an Actor in his Poem," a "whole creation" of which "shadowy Persons" are to be found in Spenser, who had "an admirable talent" in these representations. Hughes's praise of Addison's "visions" [i. lvi], his share in the *Tatler, Spectator,* and *Guardian,* his intimacy with Addison as exemplified in the latter's asking him to write a fifth act for *Cato,* and Steele's panegyrical essay on Hughes in the fifteenth number of the *Theatre* increase the probability of the critic's having at least discussed

of the *Faerie Queene* is further apparent. Knights in armor and ladies errant were in his own time antiquated figures, but " the Remains of the old *Gothick* Chivalry were not quite abolish'd when Spenser wrote.[28] In this recognition of an influence other than classic or Italian lies the genesis of a brilliant new theory to be more fully developed by Thomas Warton and Hurd and to become the mainspring of modern investigation: that the *Faerie Queene* is the joint product not only of foreign sources but of the mediaeval and native influences of the poet's age. This was the first use of the historical method in Spenserian criticism, and as such, a natural consequence of the scientific spirit of the late seventeenth century.

But classical and Italian sources received corresponding attention. As Homer supposed Minerva to attend Telemachus, Spenser gave Guyon the Palmer for a guide and counselor. To Virgil is ascribed an indebtedness for the episode of Fradubio and Fraelissa, the description of Belphoebe, and the visit of Britomart to the abode of Merlin, which last, however, Hughes finds, is more immediately from Ariosto, whom Spenser also

his edition with the essayists. But Hughes may have derived his interest in part from Dryden, as may Addison also. Cf. Dryden's " that fairy kind of writing, which depends only upon the force of imagination " [*Dedication to King Arthur, Works,* ed. Scott and Saintsbury, viii. 136].

[28] Hughes, i. lxiii. Cf. John Dennis's statement (1704) that by virtue of its subject and characters, *Paradise Lost* could not possibly be subjected to the classic rules, but that instead of being against them, the poem was above the rules [*The Grounds of Criticism in Poetry,* b_3]; and the elder J. Richardson's opinion (1734) that " 'tis of no great Importance whether . . . *Paradise Lost* be call'd an Heroic or a Divine Poem, or only, as the Author himself has call'd it in his Title-page, a Poem. What if it were a Composition Intirely New and not reducible under any Known Denomination? " [*Milton's Editors and Commentators,* 110]. Cf. Warton's criticism of the *Faerie Queene,* pp. 121-123.

imitated in the moral introductions to the several books. The stories of Marinel and the birth of Belphoebe and Amoret are after the manner of Ovid, and the Bower of Bliss is discovered in Tasso.

Nor is the English Chaucer forgotten. From him Spenser drew the tale of Cambel and Canacee, and the manner of the *Shepheardes Calender* and *Mother Hubberds Tale.* Yet, however much Spenser's affection led him to copy his master, their genius was different. Chaucer excelled in characters. Spenser was

> of the serious Turn, had an exalted and elegant Mind, a warm and boundless Fancy, and was an admirable Imager of Vertues and Vices . . . The Embellishments of Description are rich and lavish in him beyond Comparison.[29]

Perhaps no earlier or later criticism more admirably sets forth Spenser's best qualities than this enumeration from Hughes's essay. Furthermore, while he at all times commends the poet's moral, it was not the allegorical character of the *Faerie Queene* which, in Hughes's opinion, constituted its chief merit, but the *character* of the allegory—that "surprizing Vein of fabulous Invention, which runs thro it, and enriches it every where with Imagery and Descriptions more than . . . in any other modern Poem."[30]

Contemporaneous criticism tended to observe "beauties" rather than "faults," and fostered the idea that great beauties excused faults. Hence Hughes hoped that his *Essay on Allegorical Poetry* might more easily reveal the beauties and excuse some of the irregularities of the *Faerie Queene.* For Spenser was not with-

[29] *Ibid.*, i. xxvii.

[30] *Ibid.*, i. lviii. Cf. *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century,* ed. W. H. Durham, xxii.

out faults: "Abundance betrays him into Excess, and his Judgment is overborne by the Torrent of his Imagination." [31] Hughes esteemed Spenser's power of invention, but he was not uninfluenced by current tendencies to prune the exuberance of fancy and check the impetuosity of imagination. His position is comparable to that of Thomas Warton.[32] He delighted in a poet who "makes such perpetual and powerful appeals to the fancy," but, like Warton, he approved of the order and restraint which rules induce. His attitude towards rules, however, was one neither of blind adherence nor blind opposition. He recognized that the *Faerie Queene* was not to be judged by the rules for the classical epic. But rules were "useful to help our Observation in distinguishing the Beauties and the Blemishes" of works already produced.[33] When he discovered that critics had left no rules for judging an allegory, he mentioned four "qualities," or rules, essential to the genre.[34]

But that which was "the most liable to Exception" in the *Faerie Queene* was the model and the choice the author made of so romantic a story. Spenser might have imitated the best writers of antiquity but preferred the Italians, who were then in the greatest vogue. He might more advisably have followed Tasso, but he found Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* more agreeable to his genius.[35] He might have discovered a better plan,

[31] *Ibid.*, i. lix. [32] See pp. 121-122. [33] Hughes, i. xlvi.

[34] Three of these relate to the fable, and the last concerns the moral. They are: that the fable be lively and surprising in order to raise and entertain the reader's curiosity; that it be elegant or proper, and apt to the subject on which it is employed; that it be everywhere consistent; and finally, that the moral be clear and intelligible [i. xlvii-1]. Cf. p. 48.

[35] Hughes, i. lxi.

but " a Bent in Nature . . . apt to determine Men that particular way in which they are most capable of excelling " perhaps directed his choice to " a Model which might give the greatest Scope to that Range of Fancy . . . so remarkably his Talent." Hughes's is the first suggestion that the poet's choice, otherwise unfortunate, was that best fitted to his gifts; it is an ungrudging acknowledgment that individual temperament is a valuable factor in poetic production.[36] Nor is it without note that Thomas Warton even much later neglects to remark such a possibility.[37] The poet's plan, however, is much more regular than Ariosto's, and his fable, though often wild, is always emblematical. In keeping with a contemporary critical insistence that epics must have a moral in their allegory, Hughes confesses that were Spenser's perpetual stories of knights, giants, castles, and enchantments not turned into allegory, they too would be very trifling.[38]

But Hughes descries a lack of unity. The several books of the *Faerie Queene* " appear rather like so many several Poems, than one entire Fable "; each has its peculiar knight and is independent of the rest.[39] The first considered as an entire work of itself—with one principal action completed in the twelfth canto—is commended as " no irregular Contrivance." The others are not so regular. Characters re-appearing in various books effect little connection. Arthur, who has

[36] *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century,* xxii.

[37] Cf. p. 117.

[38] Hughes, i. lxii.

[39] *Ibid.,* i. lix. Cf. Dryden's statement that " there is no uniformity in the design of Spenser: he aims at the accomplishment of no one action. . . . Had he lived to finish his poem . . . it had certainly been more of a piece; but could not have been perfect, because the model was not true " [*Essays of John Dryden,* ed. Ker, ii. 28].

a share in every book, is not considerable enough in any one of them. He appears and vanishes again like a spirit, being lost sight of too soon to be the hero. Attention is thus attracted to the several parts of the poem rather than to the whole. But, as Hughes observes, such insistence upon the classical unity found in Homer and Virgil is irrelevant, since Spenser's purpose is different. To compare the poem with the models of antiquity was like drawing a parallel between the Roman and Gothic architecture.[40] So examined the whole frame seems "monstrous." The *Faerie Queene* ought rather to be considered

a Poem of a particular kind, describing in a Series of Allegorical Adventures or Episodes the most noted Virtues and Vices.[41]

Subsidiary defects in the plan concern Arthur's participation in the plot and the nature of the faeries. The scene being laid in Faery Land, the chief actors are faeries, yet Arthur, "an historical Person," is mingled with them but no part of his history is represented. Hughes was inclined to believe that Spenser had retold the fabulous accounts of Arthur and his victories over the Saxons in some of the last books of the *Faerie Queene*.[42] Secondly, unaware that diminutiveness was not necessarily characteristic of faeries, he found it difficult to conceive one encouraging a monster or a giant. But he thought it plain that by the literal sense of Faery Land, Spenser

only design'd an *Utopia*, an imaginary Place; and by his *Fairies*, Persons of whom he might invent any Action proper

[40] Cf. Hurd, p. 120. [41] Hughes, i. lx. [42] *Ibid.*, i. lxvi.

to human Kind, without being restrain'd, as he must have been, if he had chosen a real Scene and historical Characters.[43]

In the mystical sense Faery Land, as the poet indicated, was England; the Faery Queen Elizabeth; and the fifth book a " figurative Representation " of Elizabeth's reign. Hughes's identification of the queen as Mercilla, Netherlands as Belge, Spain as Geryoneo, the Execution of Justice as Talus, and the trial of Duessa as that of Mary Stuart was the first published explanation of the historical allegory in the fifth book.[44]

Having designated the general excellencies and defects of the *Faerie Queene*, Hughes enumerates those " principal Beauties " in each book which particularly exhibit the genius of Spenser.[45] His decisions are based chiefly upon moral value, classical reminiscences, decorum, and enjoyment. Thus the moral in the dungeon of Pride is " truly noble "; Belphoebe's lines in praise of glory kindle in the mind a generous emulation.[46] Hughes admires Duessa's visit to Night because here Spenser has imitated the classic poets.[47] The story of the Squire of Dames and the intrigue between Paridel and Hellenore savor " of the coarse and comick Mixtures in *Ariosto*." [48] The Bower of Bliss abounds " with the most pleasurable Ideas and Representations

[43] *Ibid.*, i. lxv.

[44] Cf. Dryden's " The original of every knight was then living in the court of Queen Elizabeth; and . . . [Spenser] attributed to each of them that virtue, which he thought was most conspicuous in them " [*Essays,* ii. 28].

[45] Hughes, i. lxvii.

[46] *Ibid.*, lxxix.

[47] *Ibid.,* i. lxx. The Cave of Mammon diversifies the entertainment of the second book, but the allegory in the House of Temperance seems debased by a mixture of too many low images [i. lxxxii].

[48] *Ibid.*, i. lxxxvi.

which the Fancy of the poet cou'd assemble together." Especially commended are the transformation of Malbecco (a passage later much praised by Jortin, and, in general, admired by neo-classicists),[49] the Masque of Cupid, the Garden of Adonis, the Vision of Colin Clout, the Fable of Arlo-hill and the River Molanna, and the pageants of the *Mutabilitie* cantos, the conclusion of which is not only great but invested with a noble moral.[50] A neo-classical enthusiasm often determined Hughes's choice, as is frequently evident in the emphasis which he places upon such neo-classical characteristics as an insistence upon the moral value of poetry; a regard for rules, especially as they concern decorum and verisimilitude; a fondness for classical imitations; a respect for reason and desire to curb the exuberance of fancy; an objection to the mixture of comic and serious matter; and a tendency to point out the beauties of a work of art rather than the faults. At the same time, Hughes missed few of the purple patches. A painter and musician, as well as a poet, he was peculiarly responsive to Spenser's imagery.

Hughes was also more appreciative of Spenser's stanza and versification than most of his contemporaries. He could discover no source for the stanza other than the ottava rima improved by Spenser with the addition of an alexandrine, but he commended its well-sounding epithets and found it more harmonious than the heroic verse of Spenser's age.[51] The poet was not always equal to himself in his versification, but he was

[49] Cf. p. 57.

[50] Hughes, i. xci.

[51] Instances of tumbling verse occur only where Spenser has purposely imitated Chaucer; the stanza grows tiresome, however, in long or narrative poems.

superior to all his contemporaries and even to those that followed him for sometime, with the exception of Fairfax. He was a great improver of English numbers.[52] Here again Hughes's poetic and musical gift doubtless made him more delicately sensitive to the quality of Spenser's lines.

An immediate interest in the pastoral directed Hughes's especial attention to the *Shepheardes Calender* and led to his qualified praise.[53] Differences between the *Faerie Queene* and the earlier poem are such as those between a royal palace and a little country seat.[54] Critics not having yet fixed the model for pastoral writing, Hughes was embarrassed, as in the case of the major poem, by lack of criteria for evaluating the pastorals.[55] They may have too much *merum rus*, but if so, Spenser has erred on the right side, for whatever the rules, the essentials of such poetry are love and the images of a country life. Regarding Spenser's use of satire, the editor is more dubious, though he grants that its moral value may in great measure recompense an interruption of "the Tranquillity and Pleasure which shou'd every where reign in Pastoral Poems." [56] *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, in which

[52] Hughes, i. xciii. Current objections to Spenser's rhymes may be partly attributed to the tremendous popularity of Milton, which had advanced the feeling that blank verse was the only vehicle for the epic. Cf. Upton's objections, pp. 100-101.

[53] The pastorals of Pope and Ambrose Philips had appeared in the same volume of Tonson's *Poetical Miscellanies* in 1709. These eventually gave rise to a literary quarrel which resulted in Gay's *Shepherd's Week*, obviously imitative of Spenser and published the year before Hughes's edition.

[54] Hughes, i. xcvii.

[55] *Ibid.*, i. xcix. Cf. p. 43, and Hurd's attitude towards the novel [*On the Idea of Universal Poetry* (1776), 153-154].

[56] *Ibid.*, i. civ.

Spenser celebrates the reigning wits and beauties of his age, several of whom Hughes identifies, has less of *merum rus* than the *Calender*, and though not without beauties is not so simple, nor so perfect as the eclogues.

That Hughes sometimes missed the poet's intent is apparent when he cites *Mother Hubberds Tale* as a specimen of Spenser's genius in satire, and adds that the poet seldom exercised his satirical talent. This poem is commended for its moral and the description of the brave courtier, in whom Hughes sees Sidney imaged.[57] The poet's " admirable " *Epithalamion, Fowre Hymnes, Daphnaida*, and elegies on the death of Sidney are " not unworthy " of his genius, but the editor neglects these to notice the sonnets, to which he ascribes that " natural Tenderness, Simplicity and Correctness " characteristic of a type of poetry but little used in his own time.[58] Despite an obvious modesty and a high regard for " men of Critical Learning," Hughes shows considerable independence of spirit, not only in establishing new criteria for evaluating the *Faerie Queene*, but in his criticism of the minor poems. Though he was the first of the eighteenth-century editors of Spenser, he was the best critic among them.

Largely dependent upon the accounts given by Camden and upon the summary in the last folio, Hughes's biography adds little new information. To disprove " 1510 " as the poet's birth year, Hughes cites Camden's " *immatura morte*," the poet's reported application for a fellowship,[59] and the improbability of Spenser's hav-

[57] *Ibid.*, i. cvii.

[58] *Ibid.*, i. cx.

[59] On the loss of which, disappointment and " the Narrowness of his Circumstances " forced him to leave Cambridge.

ing been sixty when he wrote the *Shepheardes Calender.* He notes that the poet's fortune and interest seemed at first setting out to have been very inconsiderable in spite of his claiming affinity, in the dedications of one or two of his poems, with persons of distinction.[60] He records Spenser's probable residence in the north of England as authentic, and relates the tale of Sidney's admiration for the Despair canto, though he does not know whether it is worthy of credit.[61] He points out, in the *Ruines of Time*, *Teares of the Muses*, and *Mother Hubberds Tale*, evidences of Spenser's resentment of Burleigh's unkindness; recounts the " reason-rime " anecdote; and accepts as fact Spenser's probable journey to the continent in the service of Leicester. In Ireland, the poet discharged his duties " with very good Skill and Capacity," contracted the friendship with Raleigh celebrated in *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, and was more successful in love, as may be seen from his *Amoretti* and *Epithalamion.* Ware's story of the lost books and Camden's report of Spenser's last days and obsequies indicate, however, that the poet was again pursued by a train of misfortunes.

At the close of the biography, after giving an account of Hugolin Spenser from the last folio, Hughes adds that " a Person came over from *Ireland*, in King *William's* Reign, to sollicit the same Affair, and brought with him Letters of Recommendation as a Descendent of *Spenser.*" He was a man " somewhat advanc'd in Years, and might be the same mention'd before, who had possibly recover'd only some part of the Estate at first, or had been disturb'd in the Possession of it." [62] This was not Hugolin, however, but William Spenser,

[60] Hughes, i. ii. [61] *Ibid.*, i. v. [62] *Ibid*, i. xxii.

who, as Hughes says, was befriended by Congreve, and thereby enabled to obtain his suit.[63]

Dr. Johnson said that Hughes's edition did not much revive the curiosity of the public because it was not reprinted till 1750, some thirty years later.[64] But if the edition affected the general popularity of the poet only slightly, later editors leaned heavily on Hughes. They quote him copiously, and all before Todd follow his text of the minor poems. Nor is it a far step from Hughes's recognition of the chivalric influence on the *Faerie Queene* to Theobald's statement that the first duty of a critic is to " be well vers'd in the History and Manners of his Author's Age, if he aims at doing him a Service." [65] Hughes led in the revaluation of Spenser's achievement.

[63] *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell,* ed. Carlyle-Lomas, iii. 489.

[64] *Lives of the Poets,* ed. Hill, ii. 162. There were more than thirty years between Hughes's edition (1715) and the last folio (1679). See p. 33.

[65] Preface to his *Shakespeare* [*Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare,* ed. D. N. Smith (1903), 84]. Cf. Thomas Warton, pp. 115-116.

CHAPTER THREE

IMPROVEMENT OF THE TEXT

CHAPTER THREE

IMPROVEMENT OF THE TEXT

The first work influenced by Hughes's edition was John Ball's reprint of Bathurst's *Calendarium Pastorale* in 1732. In a foreword, the editor reports the edition of 1653 as seldom met with among the booksellers. In his new edition he had taken great pains that the verses lack nothing *emendationis* or *ornatus*. What Ball chiefly did was to add Hughes's emended "Arguments," together with Latin translations, to correct the omission of the twelfth stanza in the June eclogue, to augment the glossary, and to furnish a new biography. In Latin, this last follows Hughes's account quite closely, but adds several facts of importance apparently from Elijah Fenton's *Observations on Mr. Waller's Poems.* These include the dates of the poet's matriculation and degrees at Cambridge, on the basis of which he suggests that Spenser's birth was "circiter annum 1553," and evidence from Nicholas Stone's diary that Stone "mad a Monement for M^{er} Spencer, the Pooett, and set it up at Westmester," for which the Countess of Dorset paid him forty pounds.[1]

Ball's edition of the *Calender* was followed by Dr. John Jortin's *Remarks on Spenser's Poems.* Published anonymously in 1734 and reprinted in 1790 under the name of the author in *Tracts, Philological, Critical and Miscellaneous*, Jortin's work is a collection of notes on selected passages from the *Faerie Queene* and the minor poems, with particular emphasis on classical influences

[1] Cf. *Observations on Mr. Waller's Poems, Works of Edmund Waller* (1729), ed. Fenton, xxix-xxx. The diary was in the possession of George Vertue, who illustrated Fenton's *Waller.*

and corrections of the text. The original edition included *Remarks on Milton's Poems*; the reprint was augmented by additional notes "Communicated by a friend" to Rogers Jortin, the author's son and editor of his *Tracts*.[2] The method is similar to that employed in Jortin's *Critical Remarks* on Greek and Latin authors: the commentator explains the text, cites innumerable parallels, now and again identifies a source, criticizes the poet's treatment of material, and briefly notes matters of style. Explanations usually relate to classical allusions and diction, Spenser's frequent ellipses, and his Biblical phrasing.

Not unaware of native antiquarianisms the critic remarks the poet's use of "can" as "gan" or "did" in the *Faerie Queene* at I. I. viii. 5, and elsewhere.[3] Although Spenser's lines remind him of passages from the Bible, Milton, and less often Shakespeare, Dryden, Racine, and Scaliger, Jortin's parallels are mostly classical. Catalogues of trees such as the one in the *Faerie Queene* (I. I. viii) are cited in Ovid, Seneca, Lucan, Statius, and Claudian, but Chaucer's list is unnoted.[4] Otherwise of little consequence, the parallels, as well as the sources, point to Jortin's wide range of classical authors, including Hesiod, Pindar, Herodotus, Plato, Apollodorus, Apollonius, Cicero, Lucretius, Catullus, Tibullus, Horace, Ovid, Seneca, Valerius, Flaccus, Lucan, Martial, Plutarch, Statius, Juvenal, Ausonius, Claudian, Sidonius, Natalis Comes, and others. Jortin was the first to observe that Spenser derived Agdistes (II. XII. xlviii) from Natalis Comes, and the Grille episode in the same book (XII. lxxxvi) from Plutarch.[5]

[2] *Tracts, Philological, Critical and Miscellaneous*, i. 286.
[3] *Remarks on Spenser's Poems*, 5.
[4] *Ibid.*, 3-5.
[5] *Ibid.*, 73, 77.

He notices an indebtedness to the pseudo-Virgilian *Ciris* in the third book,[6] but for Spenser's translation of the *Culex* had only adverse criticism.[7] A less disjointed organization would have improved Jortin's "rough draught of a Commentary,"[8] and perhaps would have led him to some general conclusions on Spenser's use and relative indebtedness to classical sources; whereas he merely remarks with disapproval the poet's alterations and mixture of pagan and Christian lore. It is unpoetical to let Hylas die when the nymphs granted him immortality;[9] when Spenser says that Saturn loved Erigone, and Bacchus Phillira[10] (III. XI. xliii), "How many mistakes are here!" Jortin exclaims, as chagrined at the poet's inaccuracies as at his name for a shepherd. "Thestylis is no name for a shepherd," he says.[11] Classical precedence and propriety are obviously the commentator's criteria. Malbecco is a cuckold, but Spenser's giving him horns is said to be "descending very low." The poet redeemed himself, however, in Malbecco's transformation, which is adjudged extremely elegant.[12]

[6] *Ibid.*, 78.

[7] An opinion contrary to that of O. F. Emerson, who defends Spenser's version, by observing that only a corrupt text of the original was available to the poet [*JEGP*, XVII. 94-118]. Cf. p. 112.

[8] *Remarks*, 168.

[9] *Ibid.*, 94.

[10] Which Jortin corrects to "*Philyra*, for that is her name" [93].

[11] *Remarks*, 164.

[12] *Ibid.*, 88. "Fine," "bold," and "elegant" are easily Jortin's favorite epithets. Thus the *Faerie Queene* II. VIII. i-ii are "fine lines, and would not suffer by being compar'd with anything that *Milton* has said upon this subject" [61]. The picture of desolation in III. III. xxxiv is another fine description, "starued den" being considered "vastly bold" and not to be condemned [81]. But the simile of the "greedie Wolfe" and the "seely Lambe" (I. VI. x) is pretty, and partly from Homer; the description of Britomart's emotion on hearing Merlin's account of the ruin of the Britons (III. III. xliii) is natural and poetical [30, 81].

Jortin was the first to suggest the need for accurate collations of the text. He had access only to the last folio and Hughes's edition, but at the close of his long array of classical quotations intimates that " much more might be done . . . towards settling the text, by a careful collation of Editions, and by comparing the Author with himself." [13] Unfortunately he lacked the time, as well as the editions, that such fundamental procedures would have required. On every few pages, however, he indicates certain changes in the text, for the most part based on common sense and a knowledge of classical literature. Of the opinion that " delight " in " Best musicke breeds delight in loathing eare " (I. VIII. xliv) was either a slip of the poet's pen or a fault of the printer, he would substitute " dislike," [14] which, as Upton says,[15] is not without reason and was accepted into the text by the editors of Hughes's reprint and Tonson's octavo (anon., 1758). Similarly he prefers " mismade " to " dismayd " (II. XI. xi), and insists that Spenser ought to have said " more than life is to be sought " (III. XI. xix) instead of " more then death." [16] A final conjecture is his happiest and one of his best identifications of source: his correction of " hag " to " stag " [17] on the evidence of the source observed in Natalis Comes, in

> Now like a Lyon, hunting after spoile,
> Now like a Hag, now like a faulcon flit:
> (III. XI. xxxix).

" Stag," as J. C. Smith says, is irresistible. Mr. Smith

[13] *Ibid.*, 168-169. Cf. p. 35, n. 8.
[14] *Ibid.*, 40.
[15] Upton, ii. 398.
[16] *Remarks*, 69, 89.
[17] *Ibid.*, 91.

is at fault, however, in crediting Upton with the source.[18]

The *Remarks* conclude with brief notes on *Brittains Ida* and Hughes's *Essay on Allegorical Poetry* and the life of Spenser. The several pages of additional notes appended to the reprint in 1790, like the original comments, are concerned with classical parallels and sources, but omit textual conjectures. They were communicated to Rogers Jortin by a correspondent who signs himself " B," probably Dr. Thomas Birch,[19] and who says that they were discovered " *in manuscript*, on the blank leaves of a printed copy " of the *Remarks*, having been " many years since drawn up by a late writer." [20] A note in the edition of Jonson's *Sad Shepherd* published in 1783 reveals that the annotator was " the late Dr. Dodd," who had written many remarks on Spenser with " references to, and extracts from, the Greek and Roman poets." [21]

Dr. Parr said that Jortin could scatter at will " wit without ill-nature and sense without effort upon every subject." [22] His *Remarks on Spenser* do not exhibit a many-sided appreciation of the poet. Nevertheless he commanded the respect of the eighteenth-century editors. Birch refers to him with commendation; Church and Upton quote him copiously; and in their narrow field his *Remarks* remain not without importance to the modern editor.

Some sixteen years passed before Jortin's injunction to collate the texts was heeded. Meanwhile interest

[18] *Faerie Queene*, ed. Oxford, ii. 512.

[19] Who edited the *Faerie Queene* (1751) and admired Jortin. See p. 65.

[20] *Tracts*, i. 286.

[21] Jonson's *Sad Shepherd*, ed. 1783, 149-150.

[22] *DNB*, article " Jortin."

in epic origins and a growing antiquarian enthusiasm favored an increasing popularity of Spenser's poetry, the *Faerie Queene* in particular. The reprint of Hughes's edition (1750) was indicative of this new interest but by no means the only expression. A separate text of the *Faerie Queene*, planned by William Kent and completed by Dr. Thomas Birch, was printed during the following year (1751), and John Upton's edition was announced.[23] Reports were current of probable issues by Thomas Edwards,[24] John Sympson,[25] and Robert Thyer.[26] It was certainly the prospect of separate texts of the *Faerie Queene* which led the Tonsons to reprint Hughes's version of the *Works.* When they announced their reprint in the *London Evening-Post* for December 6-8, 1750, news of the forthcoming Kent-Birch edition of the *Faerie Queene* (1751) must have been abroad,[27] although the proposals were not issued till July 1, 1751, and the edition was not published till October 15.[28] Proposals for John Upton's edition were announced in the *Whitehall Evening-Post* for July 27-30.[29] Obviously considerable rivalry had arisen among the publishers.

The general appearance of Hughes's reprint is in-

[23] John Upton, *A Letter concerning a new edition of Spenser's Faerie Queene* (London, 1751).

[24] *Thomas Edwards's Letters, Bodl. Ms. 1011.*

[25] *Paradise Regained,* ed. Newton, A_2 verso.

[26] *Thomas Edwards's Letters, Bodl. Ms. 1012.*

[27] For William Kent, who planned and illustrated the edition, died in 1748.

[28] See *The General Advertiser* for October 15, 1751.

[29] Surviving copies of the proposals for Upton's *Faerie Queene* bear no date. In a copy in the library of Harvard University the year " 1755 " has been supplied on the title-page, by someone unknown, in long hand. Some copies may have been issued as late as 1755, but that could hardly be the earliest date. See n. 3, p. 74.

ferior to that of the original issue. Additional is a copy of an engraving of the poet by Gerard Van der Gucht from one by George Vertue. The reprint, like its original, marks a departure. The editor repeatedly consulted the first Quarto of the *Faerie Queene* (1590) and preferred its lections to those of Hughes, who seems to have relied chiefly upon the first folio of the *Works* (1611) bound with a copy of the first three books according to a 1609 text.[30] This is evidently why he omitted the hemistich at III. VI. xlv. 4, and printed the first ending to the third book instead of Spenser's second ending written to connect III with IV. If this omission of the second ending was an error, it was a very gross one for the printer to make. The editor perhaps intended to give both endings, the first as text and the second separately, but the printer neglected the latter. Corrections of Hughes's work on the authority of the first quarto are numerous.[31] The editor's conjecture at V. XI. xli. 6, "know" for "knew," later offered by Upton,[32] has been generally adopted as an improvement in the rhyme. Several other emendations were recommended by Church.[33]

[30] See p. 35.

[31] See I. V. xxiii. 8, X. lix. 2; II. I. lix. 1, VI. xxix. 2, VIII. xxvii. 3, XII. lx. 5; III. IV. xxxiii. 4, X. xlviii, 9, etc. The editor did not correct all the alterations of the syllabic "es" introduced into the first folio; for example, at I. X. xxxix. 4, where he prints "Clothez." He printed "Tethys" (I. I. xxxix. 6) and "glitterand" (I. VII. xxix. 4) correctly, recorded "Blandamour" (IV. IV. ii. 4) where Hughes imitated the poet's error in printing "Scudamore," and was the first to introduce Jortin's correction of "hag" to "stag" (III. XI. xxxix. 8); however, he retained some of Hughes's worst blunders, such as "a Sot" for "assott" in the March eclogue of the *Calender* (1. 25), and ignored "Faults Escaped."

[32] Upton, ii. 630.

[33] For example, "fool-hardy" at I. VI. i. 6 and "lent his cursed light" at II. VI. xliii. 7.

Who the editor was is unknown. Hughes's name appears alone on the title-page but Hughes could not have revised the work because he died in 1720. William Duncombe, the brother-in-law of Hughes and editor of his *Poems* (1735) may have been responsible for the reprint of his *Spenser*.[34] But John Sympson, who shared in the preparation of an edition of Beaumont and Fletcher in 1750, may have " overseen " the work. In annotations on the texts of the two dramatists Sympson repeatedly quotes not only lines but whole stanzas of " immortal Spenser." [35] At the conclusion of his notes he affixed a brief epistle to the reader in which he points out that the good or ill success of his present " essay in criticism " would either encourage or deter him from prosecuting an edition of Spenser for which he had been collecting materials for several years. Eager to see a good edition of that fine poet, he invited " all the Learned and Ingenious Part of the World to contribute their Assistance toward the effecting it." He was persuaded that Spenser would make " a Figure no way inferior to the best *Greek* or *Roman Writers*, when published like them, *cum notis Variorum*." Meanwhile he assisted Newton in his *Milton*. In the preface to *Paradise Regained* Newton mentions the intended Spenser.[36] But Sympson died in 1755 with his projected edition unfinished.[37] Certain evidence seems to suggest that he prepared Hughes's reprint for the press. The Tonsons published the edition of Beaumont and Fletcher in which he had a large part. His

[34] Duncombe also printed Hughes's tract, *On the Complicated Guilt of Rebellion*.

[35] *Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, ed. 1750, vi. 90.

[36] *Paradise Regained*, ed. 1752, A_2 verso.

[37] Stark, Adam. *History and Antiquities of Gainsborough*, 2nd ed., 395.

annotations there chiefly concern textual changes on the authority of earlier issues and matters of diction. Such changes are characteristic of the reprint. He was preparing an annotated Spenser with the intention perhaps that the Tonsons should publish it. Rumors of other editions necessitated haste. Expecting to publish an elaborately prepared text, he may not have cared to admit his editorship of the reprint. His epistle in the *Beaumont and Fletcher* indicates a certain modesty and doubt as to his ability. The Tonsons may not have wished the name of the editor to be known. Hughes's work on an edition of Milton was unacknowledged; indeed he and Jacob Tonson, the elder, had some words about the matter.[38] The *Faerie Queene* issued by the Tonsons in 1758 also appeared anonymously. His well-known interest in Spenser, his share in another production of the Tonsons about the time of the reprint and the similarity of the changes in both texts seem to indicate that Sympson revised Hughes's work.

Kent's was the conspicuous name on the proposals, in the newspaper advertisements, and on the title-page, of the *Faerie Queene* printed in 1751, though the "new life" of Spenser by Dr. Thomas Birch which it contained was mentioned. Kent's drawings—"a very favorite work of the artist"—were "exceedingly cried up by his admirers," but in proportion disappointing to the public. Walpole reports that blame for their failure was thrown on the engraver, but that "the wretchedness of drawing, the total ignorance of perspective . . . the disproportion of the buildings, and the awkwardness of the attitudes could have been the faults of the inventor only."[39] After Kent's death in

[38] *British Museum Add. Ms. 28,275.*

[39] Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England,* ed. 1782, iv. 241.

1748, Brindley, the bookseller who promoted the edition, attempted to secure the assistance of Thomas Edwards,[40] but with little success. Brindley's angling or friendship for Birch led to Edwards's having, however, a small share in the preparation of the 1751 text. On October 1, 1751, Edwards wrote to Birch that, upon receiving the *Spenser*, he went to work as hard as he could that he might send Birch the errata as soon as possible.[41]

The edition appeared in three volumes. The first includes the dedication in the second quarto (with no reference to its variance from that of the first), the letter to Raleigh, the twenty-four prefatory poems, " an exact Collation of the two original " editions, another of the second quarto and the first folio,[42] a glossary obviously drawn from Hughes's edition of the *Works*, a life of the poet, two pages of errors of the press and conjectural emendations, and the text of two books. The other volumes contain the rest of the poem.[43] Four features of the edition are significant: the editor's attempt to collate the earliest texts, his choice of 1590 as a basic text, his attention to " Faults Escaped," and his scrutiny and substantiation of biographical facts.

Birch intended " a just Representation of the genuine Text," such as had not hitherto been given in any single edition but was " form'd from an exact Collation of the

[40] See my article, " Thomas Edwards and the Editorship of the *Faerie Queene*," *MLN*, L. 146-151.

[41] *British Museum Ms. Sloane 4305.*

[42] See p. 35, n. 8.

[43] Newspaper advertisements announced that copies would be tied up as needed; hence variants, owing perhaps to some material giving out before other. Number " A " at the University of Oklahoma lacks two pages of errors and conjectures. Number " B " has a new title-page and lacks the biography.

two original ones of the Author, compar'd in the three last Books with the first Folio . . . which . . . furnish'd Corrections of some Mistakes" in the second quarto. His collations are hardly to be termed exact. They take note, however, of the most evident large variations and of the errors corrected by the poet in "Faults Escaped." Variant readings and conjectures are frequently given from the folio of 1679, from Hughes,[44] and from Jortin's *Remarks*. But differences in the early issues in many instances go unmentioned with sometimes disastrous effect to the 1751 text, in consequence of which the edition does not at all justify Birch's exaggerated appraisal that nothing remained for the honor of Spenser and the satisfaction of the public except for the learned and ingenious to unite their efforts in writing such commentaries as Jortin's![45]

One of the chief problems confronting an editor of the *Faerie Queene* is the choice between the first and the second quarto as a basic text for the first three books. Birch consulted both quartos but gave primary authority to the first, for it was more exact than all later editions in spite of the several alterations and additions made in the second quarto. It had the further advantage of a whole page of errata, few of which were corrected in the second quarto, and most of which had "been continued and multiplied in all the subsequent Impressions."[46] In one regard Birch is quite right. The second quarto very often ignores "Faults Escaped."[47] This neglect inclined Birch to underestimate

[44] But unlike Hughes, Birch is shy of capitals.

[45] *Faerie Queene*, ed. 1751, i. xxxvii.

[46] *Ibid.*, i. xxi.

[47] This is because the first volume of the second quarto was not reset anew from Spenser's manuscript, but printed from a copy of the first quarto on which alterations had been made. Having already

it. His choices are, however, often more haphazard than logical.[48] He does not always ascribe priority to the quartos even in the first three books,[49] and sometimes has readings from editions later than the first folio.[50] The accuracy of his text is otherwise affected by

catalogued "Faults Escaped," the poet did not remark these perhaps as they appeared in the text but trusted to the vigilance of the printer, who left them uncorrected. Yet, the second quarto was produced under Spenser's direction and represents his own revisions, to mention only such large changes as the conclusion of the third book and the addition of the new stanza in the first book (XI. iii). Cf. p. 1-2.

[48] He prints "mine feeble eyne" (I. Intro. iv. 5) and "and on" (I. I. ii. 1) of the first quarto rather than the preferable "my feeble eyne" and "but on" of the second, differences unnoticed in his collations; records "for wearied" (I. I. xxxii. 6) of the latter, but corrects it in his errata to give, in this case, the better reading of the first quarto, "forwearied"; rightly retains "So pure an innocent" (I. I. v. 1) and "poisonous" (I. I. xv. 6) of the second, however, in preference to "So pure and innocent" and "poisnous" of the first, differences again unnoted in his collation; but at I. XI. xxxix. 4, prints "sting," the better lection of the first, only to depart from the reading of this quarto in the seventh line of the stanza to give the less preferable "sting" of the second quarto. Although Birch does not notice the error in his collations, "sting" and "string" were doubtless erroneously interchanged in the second edition. Yet, the sense of the passage should have directed him to the earlier reading.

[49] For example, he prefers "tempests dred" (I. I. viii. 3) and "new die" (I. II. xvii. 9), both questionable readings from the folio, to lections from the quartos. Yet Birch gives "Sir Guyon" (II. VIII. xlviii. 8) and "golding wings" (III. XI. ii. 3) of the quartos rather than the very evident "Prince Arthur" and "golden wings" of the folio. The latter, he said, furnished corrections of some mistakes in the second quarto. In several instances the "correction" was unfortunate, for example, at IV. XII. xiii. 1-2, where he preferred the metrically incorrect reading of the folio, though he suggested the quarto reading in his errata; or at IV. X. xxiii. 2, 8, where he again chose the less desirable lections and later corrected them. How large a share Thomas Edwards bore in these various alterations is, of course, unknown.

[50] At II. XII. lxiv. 9 and V. VIII. xxv. 6, he gives "th' amorous" and "said *Samient*" after the last folio.

readings without any authority,[51] by omissions and additions,[52] and particularly by changes in word order or phrasing both at the end and in the middle of the line.[53]

Irregularity of judgment with regard to his authorities and the presence of many questionable readings in his edition do not suggest that Birch contributed greatly to the improvement of the text. Still a pioneer in such matters, he could hardly have achieved a "faultless" production. His accomplishment lies in the emphasis he placed on the authority of the poet's quartos and the attention he gave to "Faults Escaped." Many of these had not been corrected in the second quarto, and, as he says, most of them had been continued and multiplied in all subsequent issues. He was the first to correct the error at I. I. xii. 5, by omitting "hardy," whereas Hughes, attempting to rectify it without consulting Spenser's errata, omitted "and."[54] Without

[51] See I. I. xviii. 4; II. VII. xxx. 1, xxxvii. 2, X. lxi. 4, XII. xliv. 8, lxi. 8; VI. X. vi. 4, xxxiv. 4, etc.

[52] See I. I. v. 2, II. xvi. 4, II. i. 8; V. X. iv. 1; VI. II, xxii. 4, etc.

[53] The poet's text reads

> Oft tempred is (quoth she) with muchell smart:
> For since my brest was launcht with louely dart
> (I. IV. xlvi).

But Birch concludes the first line with "lovely dart" and the second with "muchel smart." Rather than "And in her face faire peace" (II. II. xl. 9) he prints "And in her faire face peace." See also IV. VIII. xxiv. 5, IX. vi. 1 [commended by Church as "more after *Spenser's* manner"], XI. xxxviii. 8; V. IX. ii. 3; VI. VII. xvii. 8, etc. Birch mentioned the hemistich in the third book (VI. xlv. 4) of the folio, but did not print it in his text. Unlike any other editor, he punctuates III. X. xxiv. 6 with an interrogation.

[54] See p. 37. He was also the first to give the correct readings at I. I. xxi. 5 ("spring gins to auale"), II. xvii. 5 ("cruell spies"), II. xxix. 3 ("ymounted hie"), VIII. xi. 9 ("with hollow murmur ring"), III. I. xxx. 6 ("mard"), and elsewhere, according to "Faults Escaped."

exception editors thereafter, till the close of this study (1805), gave the first quarto primary authority and corrected "Faults Escaped" as directed; in brief, aspired to present the text as the poet gave it.

William Oldys wrote to Birch on August 22, 1751 that Birch's life of Spenser had "very observable Passages in it, both ancient and modern, which he had not met with before." [55] Deficient in many desirable facts and questionable as to the accuracy of some mentioned, it is nevertheless the best documented life that had appeared. More than the usual biographical allusions are cited from the poems, as well as from the Harvey-Spenser correspondence and *A View of the Present State of Ireland*; and facts are drawn from Camden, Ware, Fuller, the biographer of 1679, Hughes, Ball, Elijah Fenton, Fines Moryson's *Itinerary*, the Worthington-Hartlib correspondence, O'Flaherty's *Ogygia*, and notably Lodowick Bryskett's *Discourse of Civill-Life*.

Birch regrets the lack of any extensive authentic memorial of the poet, and describes previous accounts of his life as "vague, imperfect, confus'd, and fuller of Inconsistencies with Chronology and each other" than is customary in so short a compass.[56] Dates for the poet's birth and university career are taken from Ball's life,[57] and the *Calendar* and E. K.'s notes are authorities for the statement that Spenser after a residence in the north went to London to be in the "Way of Preferment," and there attached himself to some southern nobleman. The *Calender* is again given as evidence that Spenser was not a friend to pomp and luxury in

[55] *British Museum Ms. Sloane 4316.*
[56] *Faerie Queene,* ed. 1751, i. ii.
[57] See p. 55.

the clergy, and that he had a high opinion of Archbishop Grindal and an equal dislike of Bishop Aylmer. Rejecting the stories of the fellowship and Sidney's overweening admiration for the Despair canto, Birch tried to show that the *Calender* was Spenser's first introduction to Sidney, who thereafter engaged the poet to transfer his talents from pastoral to heroic poetry.[58] He records the continental journey for Leicester as fact, reports that he was able to trace the "reason-rime" anecdote no further than Fuller, cites Spenser's possible allusions to Burleigh's treatment of him, and is the first to observe that Burleigh's neglect of the poet's work was not due

> so much to any personal Prejudice against him, or Contempt of Poetry, as to Spenser's early Attachment to the Earl of *Leicester* and afterwards to the Earl of *Essex*, who were both successively Heads of a Party opposite to the Lord Treasurer.[59]

This is a sensible and logical point of view, and without further cause a sufficient reason for Burleigh not to have favored Spenser.

Birch recognizes Sidney's death as an important loss to Spenser and the occasion of *Astrophel*, but dissents from the opinion of Fenton and Dryden that the death of Sidney deprived the poet both of means and spirit to complete his *Faerie Queene*, preferring Sir James Ware's account that the last books were lost by the disorder and abuse of Spenser's servant.[60] On the basis of the allusions to the composition of the poem in the thirty-third and eightieth sonnets, he makes the first

[58] On evidence from Henry Isaacson's life of Andrews in Fuller's *Abel Redivivus* (1651) [i. iii]; i. viii.

[59] *Faerie Queene*, ed. 1751, i. xvi.

[60] *Ibid.*, i. xxiv.

attempt to substantiate this story. Having searched for the poet's will with no success, he repeats Camden's account of Spenser's last days and burial, and quotes Fenton as to the erection of the monument. He adds nothing new to the accounts given of the poet's descendants.

The biography concludes with a comment on the *Faerie Queene* in which the author cites Sackville's *Induction* as an excellent model for the allegorical form, and indicates that the " general design " is more fully discovered in Lodowick Bryskett's *Discourse of Civill-Life.* He touches on the political allegory, criticizes the stanza and versification in the manner of Hughes, opines that the poet's ancient words and idioms were chosen to give a greater solemnity to his subjects, quotes copious extracts from the opinions of Temple, Rymer, Dryden, and Hughes, but maintains that the *Faerie Queene*, whatever its defects of plan or execution, is " one of the noblest Efforts of Genius in any Age or Language." [61]

[61] *Ibid.*, i. xxxi.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE HIGH-TIDE OF INTEREST

CHAPTER FOUR

THE HIGH-TIDE OF INTEREST

Just a hundred years after Spenser's name was omitted from William London's *Catalogue of the most vendible books in England* (1658) three editions of the *Faerie Queene* were issued in quick succession. Though all three are imprinted 1758,[1] *The Daily Advertiser* announced the first (anon.) on April 13, 1758, the second (Upton) on January 13, 1759, and the third (Church) on January 22. Thus there were only a few months between the first two editions and only nine days between the second and third, a sufficient reason why the editors of the two last do not refer to the work of each other, and evidence, together with the advertisements in the journals, that the rivalry among the booksellers in 1750 had been renewed in 1758. An anonymous octavo in two volumes and John Upton's elaborately annotated quarto, both Tonson publications, preceded the edition prepared by Ralph Church and issued by William Faden. While it is not impossible that there was a demand in the mid-century for such a cheap edition[2] as the first, it seems probable that the Tonsons, fearing that John Upton's text, which they had secured

[1] Except the second volume of Church's edition, which is imprinted 1759 (sometimes "MCCLIX," obviously a mistake).

[2] It sold for ten shillings, which was considerably less than the guinea paid for the other two [*The Daily Advertiser,* April 13, 1758]. A "few" copies of Upton's edition printed "on large paper" were advertised at a guinea and a half. Competition reduced the price, for the proposals announced that "a few" would be printed "on superfine paper" at "two guineas and a half," all others to be sold at "one guinea and a half."

some years previously, would not be ready before Faden printed his,[3] issued a hurriedly prepared octavo.

At any rate, the octavo edition was printed from the text as given in the reprint of Hughes in 1750. Besides the text the first volume comprises Hughes's life of the poet, his *Remarks on the Fairy Queen*, the letter to Raleigh, and an " advertisement " based on Hughes's remarks concerning his own edition. The glossary appears in the second volume. The text differs chiefly from the version of 1750 in its reliance upon " Faults Escaped " and further dependence upon the first quarto. Birch's work had not been without effect. Lections from the last folio (1679) and independent readings are infrequent but sometimes occur.[4] I have discovered no clue as to the editor.[5]

An Annotated Faerie Queene

John Sympson had expected to edit Spenser *cum notis variorum*, but died before publishing his work.[6] Thus John Upton's *Faerie Queene* was the first annotated edition of the poem. It was preceded in 1746 by *Critical Observations on Shakespeare*, which included enough notes on Spenser to furnish Thomas Warton with material for one of the chapters in his famous commentary; in 1747 by *A New Canto of Spencers Fairy Queen*, an

[3] Seven years had passed since Samuel Richardson sent Edwards a copy of Upton's " specimen and proposal," which, he said, had been printed with the concurrence of the Tonsons, who supposedly owned the work [Letter dated July 27, 1751, *Richardson Correspondence, Forster Collection,* Victoria and Albert Museum, London].

[4] See V. X. ix. 8, I. X. xxii. 6, etc.

[5] It is not improbable, however, that John Duncombe, Hughes's nephew and editor of his correspondence, participated in the reprint.

[6] See p. 62.

imitation often ascribed to Upton; and in 1751 by a *Letter concerning a new edition of Spenser's Faerie Queene.* It represents then the culmination of more than a decade of interest and toil. The preface discovers that the editor had intended a further volume containing Spenser's " Pastorals, Sonnets, *&c.* together with his View of the State of Ireland, and a translation of a Socratic dialogue, entitled Axiochus . . . not taken notice of by any Editor of any part " of the poet's works.[7] Upton's death in 1760 precluded its completion.

Upton addressed the *Letter concerning a new edition of Spenser's Faerie Queene* to Gilbert West, who had urged him to undertake such a project. It is of first-rate interest because it anticipates the objectives of the edition, as well as certain features of Thomas Warton's *Observations on the Faerie Queene* (1st. ed. 1754; 2nd. ed. 1762). In six sections it outlines and distinguishes the moral and historical allegories in considerable detail; treats the poet's knowledge of older literature, including his indebtedness to Ovid, Chaucer, Ariosto, and Tasso, in particular; points out his peculiarities of style, his " overfondness " for alliteration and his hemistichs; and concludes with numerous textual conjectures. Two of Upton's specifications for a well-qualified editor are significant. First, he would require that " the last editor should consult every former edition, and that he should faithfully and fairly exhibit all the various readings of even the least authority," clearly proving that Upton to secure a good text, would compare as many editions as possible and take from them the best read-

[7] But recently published by F. M. Padelford [The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1934]. Upton, i. ix.

ings.[8] Secondly, Upton insists that an editor of Spenser should be master of the poet's "learning," for otherwise "how could he know" Spenser's "allusions and various beauties," "when and in what manner to omit them, or to lay them before his reader?"[9] These are observations easily comparable to Thomas Warton's criticism that to judge how an earlier poet's turn of thinking was affected we should look back upon the customs and manners which prevailed in his age,[10] but not dissimilar to Hughes's cataloguing the "beauties" and "defects" of the *Faerie Queene* and somewhat limited by Upton's interpretation of "learning" as knowledge of classical literature.

The edition appeared in two quarto volumes and includes besides the text and 343 pages of closely printed annotations,[11] a preface, the usual introductory material (consisting of the dedication in the 1596 quarto, the letter to Raleigh, all the complimentary and dedicatory verses), a glossary, about two pages of addenda and corrigenda, an index of authors, and Sir Kenelm Digby's *Observations on the 22. Stanza in the 9th. Canto of the 2d. Book.* It is characterized by a more careful rendering of the text, the editor's interpre-

[8] Cf. Johnson's attitude towards Shakespeare's text in his *Proposals for Printing the Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare* (1756). See A. Bosker, *Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson* (Groningen, The Hague, 1930), 72.

[9] *A Letter concerning a new edition of Spenser's Faerie Queene* (1751), 1-2. Since Theobald's Shakespearean studies (1726, 1733), one of the first requirements of an editor had been a knowledge of the manners of a poet's time and of his learning as the result of his reading. Cf. Upton's work on Spenser with Newton's *Milton* (1749, etc.). See *Milton's Editors and Commentators,* 202.

[10] Cf. p. 126.

[11] The pagination in the copy at the University of Oklahoma is correct to page 392. It then reverts to page 385 and continues consecutively to the end.

tation of the poem as an epic, the extent and value of his notes, and his scepticism as to biographical materials.

Upton's one scheme was to print the text as the author gave it. To execute his purpose as accurately as possible he had two variant copies of each quarto. The two copies of the first quarto became "the groundwork" of his text for the first three books, "with such alterations, as seemed . . . the poet's own," and had the authorities of the second quarto and the first folio. The copies of the second quarto were chiefly reserved as criteria for the fourth, fifth, and sixth books, with all conjectural emendations said to be relegated to the notes. Divergences in the same quarto are carefully recorded as in the presence or omission of the Welsh words in the first (II. X. xxiv), the editor having one with and one without the now well-known phrases.[12] Upton was confused, however, by the binding up of his copies of the folios of 1611 and 1617. He reports that the "old quarto" (1590) and the folios of 1609 and 1611 read "Lemno" (IV. V. iv. 4), whereas 1609 reads "Lemno" and 1611 "Lemnos." In emending "griesie" to "griesly" (I. IX. xxxv. 4), he ascribes "griesie" to the quartos and the folios of 1609 and 1611, and "griesly" to 1617 and 1679. Apparently, he had a first folio of the *Works* (1611) bound with the *Faerie Queene* according to the first folio of this poem (1609), and a second folio of the *Works* (1617) bound with a 1611-1612 or 13 text of the *Faerie Queene*.[13]

[12] *Faerie Queene,* ed. Upton, i. xl-xli; ii. 489.

[13] *Ibid.*, ii. 591, 404. Upton's use of the comparative method, which he advocated in his *Letter*, is obvious in his correction at IV. XII. xiii. 1. This verse being "beyond . . . due measure" as printed in

Upton's care is otherwise illustrated in a brief analysis of editions prior to his own, the first criticism of this kind in any edition. Censure falls upon printers and correctors of the press who thought themselves much wiser in Spenser's spelling than either the poet or his editors.[14] Spenser's "grandam words" are therefore especially noticed, and Upton's glossary, compiled to serve both as a dictionary and index, is far more elaborate and careful than any former one. The editor does not in every instance report the context as the poet gave it; nor does he always relegate conjectures to the notes, as already exemplified in his emendation of "griesie" to "griesly."[15] Of the opinion that the elisions in the article characteristic of the first folio came originally from the poet himself and were neglected by the printers of the quartos, Upton frequently introduces these into his text, as at III. VII. v. 1, and elsewhere.

Errors are ascribed to two primary sources: the "blotted and interlined" copy which the poet sent to the press, and "the printer's roving eye" which often reflected a "foregoing" word or lection in a previous

the folios, he "reformed" it "from the more authentick edition, the old quarto." His comment suggests that he depended upon the folio and corrected by the quartos! Frequently he wishes that he might have found a certain reading in the "old" quartos but did not. At I. XII. xv. 4, the poet's texts read "of perils sad." Upton "writ in the margin" of his book "of perils bad," but "found no authorities afterwards for it" [ii. 423].

[14] *Ibid.*, i. xxxix.

[15] And exemplified elsewhere in his printing "fortaught" (I. VII. xviii. 7) and "enrold" (II. II. xliv. 4), the one only with the authority of the Tonson octavo and the other without any authority, and in his preferring "feude" (II. I. iii. 2), "sailed" (II. VI. xxxviii. 5) and "cuffing" (IV. IV. xxix. 6) to "food," "salied," and "cuffling."

line.[16] Decorum, verisimilitude, inadequate knowledge of the language, rhyme, and Biblical diction are the basis for the large number of the editor's conjectures. Unable to discover a classical source for the epithet "angry" applied to Jove by Spenser in his account of the love between the sovereign god and the Earth, Upton deemed the use highly "improper." "Angry" was no term with which to allude to Jove's "*laetae conjugis*" when he might have said "father Jove" and followed the best authorities![17] The poet relates that Sansfoy

> tumbling downe aliue,
> With bloudy mouth his mother earth did kis,
> Greeting his graue . . .
>
> (I. II. xix).

"Aliue" being not only "unpoetical" but without any idea or proper image just after the poet has said that Sansfoy's "head was clefte," Upton would emend to "biliue." The next several verses reveal that the Sarazin's "grudging ghost did striue with the fraile flesh," however, and only after his fall "flitted is." The editor's misinterpretations sometimes make readings more complicated than the original, as in "A fit false dreame, than can delude the sleepers sent," in which "allegory . . . propriety and rhyme" all direct to the "easy correction" of "sent" to "shent," although, as Warton and Church both point out, "sent" is merely the old spelling for "scent."[18] Upton's easy alteration of

[16] Upton, ii. 400, 556, 577, 629; 357, 359, 623. Hence such "errata" as "wex old" (I. II. iv. 7), which Upton would alter to "wex cold" on the supposition that one of the strokes of the "x" was separated from the other in Spenser's manuscript, "cowheard feare" (V. X. xv. 5) and "match a man in might" (V. VIII. ii. 2).

[17] *Ibid.*, ii. 337.

[18] *Ibid.*, ii. 351.

" knew " to " know " (V. XI. xli. 6) was for the sake of rhyme.[19] At IV. VII. xxvi and elsewhere, he emended to avoid identical rhymes, which he thought that Spenser sometimes used " by necessity," but were more often the fault of the printer.[20] Spenser's repeated imitation of Biblical language is his authority for numerous conjectures, such as at II. VIII. viii, where he suggests changing " Watch thou, I pray " to " Watch thou and pray," or " Watch thou, I say." [21] At V. III. xl. 5, certain editors have wished to give Spenser's epithet " louely " to the " ladies" instead of the " knights," but Upton would by no means alter the verse because " Spenser knew his readers would apply it to the *ladies* " ! Moreover it was the poet's manner " thus to sport with his epithet, and to disjoin it from its proper substantive." [22] Only a few of Upton's many suggestions, these are, however, fairly representative of his argumentative skill, classical bias, and abundant eighteenth-century humor. They illustrate a type of editorship common in the Augustan period.

To Upton the *Faerie Queene* was an " Epic and Moral poem," intermeddled with " the concealed histories of the times and the persons of the poet's age." [23] Like Hurd, he was not wholly indifferent to the likeness between the " extensive and complicated " story of the poem and " some ancient and magnificent pile of Gothic architecture "; yet he was aware of marked dissimilarity, for whereas the latter could not be comprehended in " one full view," he was convinced that the poet had proceeded " with great art and conduct " that the reader might have " a compleat and just view

[19] Cf. p. 61.
[20] Upton, ii. 594.
[21] Cf. pp. 92-93.
[22] *Ibid.*, ii. 617.
[23] *Ibid.*, i. ix.

of his poetical building." [24] To Upton this was evidence that whatever its Gothic aspects, the *Faerie Queene* was patterned according to the tenets of the epic. Hence his preface is in large part concerned with the general plan of the poem considered as an epic and moral poem with historical allusions. He deviates from previous criticism to show, not how the *Faerie Queene* neglected, but how it conformed to classic laws. Beginning with unity, he proceeds to greatness and probability, canons much cherished by neo-classicists.[25]

Augustans acknowledged Homer the greatest of poets.[26] To Homer then, Upton turned for proof of the unity of the *Faerie Queene*. The *Iliad* had been attacked formerly as "nothing else, but a parcel of loose songs and rhapsodies concerning the Trojan war." The *Faerie Queene* had been similarly assailed. But that the unity of action is not violated by the introduction of any ill-joined or heterogenous parts Upton discovers in the "fable or plot," with its requisite beginning, middle, and end. For, he says, "what is the action" but that a British Prince sees in a vision the Fairy Queen, falls in love, goes in search and at length was to find her? [27] The poem does not open with the mission of Arthur, yet thereby, the reader is kept in suspense regarding the chief hero "till 'tis proper to introduce him with suitable pomp and magnificence." Justification is again found in Homer. The classic poet "sings

[24] Cf. pp. 119-120; cf. Hughes, pp. 41, 45; Upton, ii. 610.

[25] Cf. Blackmore's definition of an epic as "a feign'd, probable, wonderful and allegorical Story, of a great Atchievement perform'd by some illustrious Person, extended by various Incidents or Episodes, and related in Verse, of the sublime Stile, to afford Delight and Instruction" [*Essays upon Several Subjects*, 16-17].

[26] See Pope's preface to the *Iliad*.

[27] Upton, ii. 610; i. xx-xxi.

of the anger of Achilles and its fatal consequences to the Grecians," but no objection to the unity of the *Iliad* is raised when Achilles is "scarcely . . . mentioned in several books," these being taken up with the exploits of Agamemnon, Diomed, and Hector, as the books of the *Faerie Queene* with the adventures of Arthur's knights; hence Upton expostulates: "What . . . you allow to the old Grecian, be not so ungracious as to deny to your own countryman." [28] The similarity is stressed. Homer did not call his epic *Achilleid*, nor did Spenser name his for Arthur, but because "his hero fought for the Fairy Queen in Fairy Land, and therein performed his various adventures," he entitled the poem "*The Fairy Queen*." The adventures of Arthur then are necessarily connected with the adventures of the knights of Faery Land. There being danger, however, lest the underplots should grow too large for the body of the entire action, several incidental intrigues had to be unravelled so that when "Arthur had been perfected in heroic and moral virtues, and his fame thoroughly known and recognized in Fairy Land," we should have seen him "eclipsing all the other heroes, and in the end accompanied with the Fairy Knights making his solemn entry into the presence of Gloriana." [29] Such is Upton's method of refuting Dryden's declaration that the poem lacks "uniformity of design" and Hughes's remark "that the several books appear rather like so many several Poems, than one entire Fable." [30]

Convinced of the unity of the *Faerie Queene*, Upton turns to its evidences of greatness and probability.

[28] *Ibid.*, i. xxii-xxiii.
[29] *Ibid.*, i. xxiv.
[30] See p. 44; but cf. Hurd's opinion, p. 120.

These he finds set forth in the poet's choice of a hero—"who knows not Prince Arthur?"—and in the plot. Spenser names the times when his wonders were performed, mentions the persons who performed them, and points out the places where they occur. His are, therefore, probable tales. But a poet can do more than make his poem probable; he can so contrive his fable "that more might be meant, than meets the eye or ear." [31] He may make his plot allegorical. This was the way of Spenser. The editor cannot resist noting, however, that classical literature was often so fashioned, as illustrated in Hesiod's *Theogony*, the "fable of Prodicus," and the "picture of Cebes."

The *Letter* to Raleigh had defined the *Faerie Queene* as "a continued Allegory, or darke conceit," and Hughes had discussed its character as such at some length. Later Warton recognized that it was "equally" moral and "historical or political," but no one before Upton had given detailed study to the historical intent. A letter to Burleigh from Robert Bowes dated November 12, 1596, from Edinburgh, reports that King James had "conceaued great offence against Edward Spencer publishing in prynte in the second book p[ar]t of the Fairy Queene and the ix*th* chapter some dishonorable effects (as the k. demeth thereof) against himself and his mother deceassed." [32] In the next century Dryden had said that the original of every knight was to be found in the court of Queen Elizabeth, and Hughes and Birch had followed with a few specific identifications. These are mere hints compared with Upton's extensive study. With the suggestions given in the *Let-*

[31] Upton, ii. 427; i. xxv.

[32] "Book" is deleted in the MS. [*A Reference Guide to Spenser*, 41]. The reference is V. IX.

ter and the introductions to books two and three, the latter proceeded to identify all the important and many of the lesser characters, as well as to interpret many episodes. His identification of Arthur as Leicester is of primary importance, since scholars previously had found Sir Philip Sidney mirrored in the prince. Upton was himself originally of this opinion,[33] but by the time of the second edition of *Critical Observations on Shakespeare* (1748) [34] and his *Letter* to West, he had wavered. "Were it not for . . . tradition," he says, "I should be inclined to believe the Earl of *Leicester* imaged under this faery knight: 'twas the Earl . . . who made that great figure in the *Netherlands*; 'twas he whom Queen *Elizabeth* even encouraged in his addresses to her: and if we judge too from his Character," he wanted the Redcross Knight's gift of the New Testament much more than Sidney.[35] In his edition Upton was wholly won to the opinion that the prince represented Elizabeth's favorite for he had learned from Holinshed that the great figure the earl made in the Low Countries added to his being a favorite of Queen Elizabeth, "made them call him *Arthur of Britain.*" [36] His suggestion that Guyon and the Palmer are Essex and Whitgift is far less happy than his seeing Sidney as Calidore, Lord Grey as Arthegal, Ireland as Irena, and "that bright sword, the sword of Iustice," given Arthegal by Astraea, as the sword Grey received on becoming Lord Deputy of Ireland. Other allusions in the fifth book are said to be "so very apparent, that the

[33] "Arthur represents his patron, Sir Philip Sidney" [*Critical Observations on Shakespeare,* 1st. ed., n. 39].

[34] The second omits the note given in the first edition.

[35] *A Letter concerning a new edition of Spenser's Faerie Queene,* 7-8.

[36] Upton, ii. 332. Camden and Melvil are also given as authorities for the queen's partiality to Leicester [i. xvii].

most superficial readers . . . never could mistake them." These are such as Sir Bourbon, the Lady Flourdelis, the Lady Belge, Mercilla, and Geryoneo. In Duessa's two paramours are imaged the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland;[37] in the "two springalls," the Marquis of Haurée and Adolph Metkerk. The Lord Treasurer Burleigh is discovered as

> . . . a sage old Syre, that had to name
> The *Kingdomes care* . . .
> (V. IX. xliii).

Walsingham is seen in "old Sir Sergis"; the king of Spain, in the son of Geryon, in the Soldan, and in Grantorto. The seneschal seems to be the Duke of Alva.[38] The editor questions whether he will be "too refining" to suppose that "the Sarazin Pollente, with his trap-falls and *his groome of evil guize*," alludes to Charles IX of France; if not, then Guizor, he opines, must be the Duke of Guise and the plot to murder Britomart (V. VI. xxvii) but "a type of that plot laid against the chief of the British, as well as other protestant noblemen." In the eighth canto he sees described in close detail the English victory "over this falsely called Invincible Armada," the four engagements between the two fleets being represented in stanzas xxx-xxxi, xxxii-xxxiii, xxxiv-xxxv, and xxxvii-xxxviii.

The tilts and tourneys at the marriage of Florimel may be copied from those performed "by the Earl of Arundel, Lord Windsor, Sir Philip Sidney, and Sir Fulk Grevil," and arranged to entertain the French nobility who came to treat of the French duke's marriage with the queen. In Braggadocchio and Trompart

[37] *Ibid.*, ii. 633, 565.

[38] *Ibid.*, ii. 634.

Upton " sometimes " sees a faint resemblance " to the Duke of Anjou and his servant Simier." In fact, he cannot help thinking that they are proper types for the duke and his servant.[39] But of all the historical characters delineated Upton considers that of Raleigh in Arthur's squire " the most striking." In Timias's romance with Amoret he reads Raleigh's affair with Elizabeth Throgmorton,[40] who, Upton thinks, is also depicted in Serena; for though loved by Calepine, Serena was taken to the hermit's cell with Timias to be healed of wounds inflicted by calumny and scandal. The editor does not tell how he came upon this identification. Perhaps Belphoebe's " diuine *Tobacco* " gave him the first hint!

Marinel, with his name from the sea, is perhaps intended to represent in some particulars the Lord High Admiral Howard, a suggestive conjecture, whether or not one sees in the character a composite of several of Elizabeth's great sea-dogs.[41] Duessa is Mary Queen of Scots—and it " may reasonably be supposed . . . Amoret and Florimel in some particulars are the types of Mary." [42] Queen Elizabeth often addressed Mary with the title of sister; hence the relationship of Belphoebe and Amoret. Furthermore, " by the cruel treatment of Amoret . . . is meant, not only in the general moral the vile vassalage of Love and Beauty under the tyranny of Lust, but in the particular historical allusion, the cruel confinement and persecutions " of the Queen of the Scots by the direction of Burleigh.[43] But the queen may likewise be imaged in Florimel, who is

[39] *Ibid.*, ii. 634; i. xxxi.

[40] *Ibid.*, i. xxx; but cf. Edwin Greenlaw's *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory* (1932), 131.

[41] Upton, i. xxx. [42] *Ibid.*, i. xxxi. [43] *Ibid.*, i. xxxi-xxxii.

pursued by Prince Arthur, in the historical allusion the Earl of Leicester, " who was talked of . . . by Queen Elizabeth's consent, as the intended husband of the Queen of Scots." The monster, " with thousand spots of colours " pursuing her, perhaps typifies the queen's subjects from whom she fled " to drowne her selfe " in the seas. Upton's authority is again Camden, who reports that the queen, having escaped out of prison and been easily defeated in battle, was so terrified that she chose rather to commit herself to the dangers of the sea than to the false fidelity of her people.[44] Sir Satyrane is identified as Sir John Perrot, whose behavior was always rough and honest, though " his breeding had but little of the courtier." [45] Kingdoms often being imaged by their " arms and ensigns " (the Raven for the Dane, the Assyrian lioness for the Assyrian and Chaldean empire) the king himself was discovered in Una's Lion, the defender of the true faith. This led Upton to what he thought was the clue to the episode of the " Babes bloudie hands." He learned from Spenser's *View of Ireland* that the " Irish under *Oneal* cry *Launderg-abo*, that is, the BLOODY-HAND, which is *Oneals* badge "; and from Camden that Shane Oneill " had stained his hands with blood, and dealt in all the pollutions of unchast embraces." [46]

Some of Upton's identifications were undoubtedly " pursued . . . too far." Notwithstanding, his study of the historical allegory remains after almost three

[44] *Ibid.*, ii. 557-558.

[45] *Ibid.*, ii. 388 (first 388, see n. 11, p. 76); i. xxix.

[46] *Ibid.*, i. xxviii-xxix. The books and papers vomited by Errour are the abusive pamphlets which the Roman Catholics aimed at Elizabeth (I. I. xx); Belgard is Belvoir; Sir Bellamour, the Earl of Rutland; and Mirabella, Rosalind [i. xxxi; ii. 655; i. xiv]. Cf. p. 102.

quarters of a century not only the most distinctive feature of his edition, but the most valuable *single* contribution to the subject. It has been the source and incentive of much contemporary research.

What Upton says concerning the *Faerie Queene* as a "moral poem" is found largely in his notes. These he terms "explanatory and critical," showing that if his primary motive was to edit a correct text, his secondary was to explain the text, and to note wherein the poet had succeeded or failed in his efforts. Exposition was necessary because the poem "seems to have been hitherto very little understood." [47] Hence Upton's observations on the moral allegory, like his remarks on the historical, are for the most part identifications and explanations to clarify the poet's meaning for the reader. It was his belief that the two allegories appeared at one and the same time. The "city of glory," the great Cleopolis, where Gloriana reigned, was also the London of Elizabeth Tudor, her "ladies and louely knights." [48] Where he did not find the moral allusion apparent, the reader was therefore cautioned to look for some historical significance. Perhaps Upton was himself a little too eager to discover the historical meaning; certainly doing so was little boys' fun for him; yet, he detected and remarked the moral allegory with approval, for he believed that poetry should do more than delight or entertain. "A good poet should instruct," he says.[49] How? "Not in the narration of particular facts, like an historian; but in exhibiting universal truths . . . by bringing before your eyes TRUTH in her lovely form, and ERROR in her loathsome and filthy shape; DECEIT should be stripped, and HYPOCRISIE laid open: and while wonderful stories

[47] *Ibid.*, i. xx. [48] *Ibid.*, ii. 411. [49] *Ibid.*, ii. 427.

and representations of visionary images engage the fancy, the poet should all along intend these only as initiations into the more sacred mysteries of morals and religion." Thus Upton commends Spenser's "moralized song" and expresses the preference of his day [50] for the general and universal rather than for the particular and individual in poetry.

In his *Letter* to West the prospective editor had outlined the moral allegory of the first book, and briefly that of the second. What he there remarked he stated more fully in his edition in notes on individual passages, and similarly elucidated the text of the other books. The annotations on each book are concluded with a detailed and valuable summary of the allegory. No one had, or has, given more attention to particular and general analysis than Upton. As he says, the allegory is sometimes obvious, sometimes difficult to see into. But when the reader takes off "the fabulous covering" of the poem, he soon discovers that more is meant than meets the ear or eye.[51]

Plainly Upton's conception of the *Faerie Queene* is individual in three regards. Unlike his immediate predecessors he attempted to justify the unity of the poem and to indicate its observance of other characteristics of the epic form, including greatness and probability. In asserting the classic mold of the poem he particularly emphasized the similarity between Homer and Spenser. Although he considered the *Faerie Queene* a moral allegory, he recognized that it was also an historical allegory and made the first important study of it as such.

[50] This preference was not general, however, after the middle of the century.

[51] Upton, ii. 428.

Relegated to the last half of his second volume, Upton's 343 pages of notes leave his text free from obstruction.[52] Their number, range, and erudition are amazing. Comments in general include problems in printing, the state of the poet's manuscript, criticisms of the editor's authorities and the work of other commentators, collations, conjectures, the citation of influences and sources (covering classical, Biblical, mediaeval and contemporary literatures), and discussions of the poet's style, language, and stanza, besides the matter of many individual notes of peculiar interest and value.

I have already called attention to Upton's concern with Spenser's indebtedness to classical literature, particularly to Homer. Further similarities in phrasing and literary figures are pointed out in the notes so that the reader may see how Spenser "in sense, as well as in *construction*, resembles this ancient bard and father of poetry." None of Virgil's "translators" has so faithfully expressed his meaning as Spenser.[53] He opens his poem and addresses his reader after the manner of Virgil, though thereafter he imitates Ariosto in singing "of Knights and Ladies gentle deeds."[54] Upton notes the especially frequent descriptive imitations, such as the image of Despair or of Amavia, which last he finds very like that "fine passage" representing Dido's death; for the details of Arthur's helmet the editor thinks Spenser indebted to both Virgil and Homer, the phrase, "whose tender locks" (I. VII. xxxii. 8) being "almost literally from Homer." From Virgil, however, the poet borrowed his stories of Hippolytus and of Fradubio and Fraelissa. Spenser's debt to Ovid

[52] See n. 11, p. 76.
[53] Upton, ii. 345, 355.
[54] *Ibid.*, ii. 331.

was noted in the *Letter* to West and remembered often in the edition. As early as *Critical Observations on Shakespeare* (1746), Upton referred to the poet as "Platonic Spenser" and quoted the famous opening of canto five, Book One, as an illustration of his Platonism.[55] The edition conjectures that the poet studied Plato with Sidney at Penshurst and remarks imitations in ideas and diction from the *Republic*, *Timaeus*, *Phaedo*, *Symposium*, and other of Plato's works.[56] The episode of the House of Medina in the second book is, however, drawn from Aristotle, "where he considers some of the virtues reduced to practice and habit, and places them between two extremes."[57] Gluttony in the first book is said to resemble "the old drunken god Silenus" as he appears in Virgil and Ovid, except that "like a Crane his necke was long" is from Aristotle's account of one Philoxenus, who wished that he had the neck of a crane in order to taste his food the longer.[58] Ideas and phrasings are cited from Lucretius, Catullus, Horace, Seneca, Statius, Plutarch, Natalis Comes, and many others. Not the least of Upton's findings is Spenser's imitation of Claudian in the Garden of Proserpina.[59] To what extent the poet is indebted to classical sources for his poetic materials, whether to one or several more than to others, Upton makes no effort to discover. His purpose was to clarify the poet's meaning, not to estimate the extent of his borrowings. That

[55] *Critical Observations on Shakespeare,* 1st. ed., 116.

[56] Cf. p. 101; see Upton, i. xv.

[57] *Ibid.*, ii. 440.

[58] *Ibid.*, ii. 370.

[59] *Ibid.*, ii. 466. But cf. Rosemond Tuve's "Spenser and the *Zodiake of Life*," which indicates an indebtedness to Barnabe Googe's translation of the *Zodiake of Life* (*JEGP,* XXXIV. 1-19). Cf. Warton, p. 134.

Spenser was indebted to classical literature is apparent. That he was as intimately acquainted with it as Upton's notes sometimes suggest is questionable. He may have unconsciously acquired certain classic elements that had become commonplace in Elizabethan life. Upton himself recognizes this in his frequent references to Natalis Comes, who was for Spenser and many others an epitome of these commonplaces.[60] He notes also that the poet was indebted to Boccaccio's *Genealogia Deorum*.[61] Spenser was " a great imitator of Scripture expressions." [62] Jortin had remarked this influence in passing; Upton was the first to note it with detailed concern. He cites the poet's paraphrases or exact quotations from the New Testament, especially from the four Gospels and Revelation, from Psalms, and the Song of Solomon, as well as other Biblical passages. He shows that the first book of the *Faerie Queene* is particularly indebted. Duessa and her " monstrous beast ybred in filthy fen " (I. VII. xvi) and the " new Hierusalem " (I. X. lvii) are paralleled in Revelation. The House of Holiness is discovered to be the spiritual house mentioned in the second chapter of First Peter. But particulars in the description of Belphoebe are discerned in the language and imagery of the Song. Less obvious details are identified, as in the description of Gluttony's eyes, " with fatnesse swollen," drawn from the Seventy-third Psalm. In fact, the frequency of the poet's indebtedness is the occasion of the editor's offer-

[60] *Ibid.*, ii. 387 (first 387, see n. 11, p. 76), 508, 659, etc. Cf. H. G. Lotspeich's *Classical Mythology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser* (Princeton, 1932), 14-15.

[61] See especially ii. 377, 505, etc.; cf. Lotspeich.

[62] Upton, ii. 343.

ing numerous textual emendations on the authority of Biblical thought or diction.[63]

Nor did Upton neglect Spenser's obligation to the English poets. In his *Letter* to West he points out a fair number of Chaucerian imitations in words and phrases. He wished that Spenser had never thought of completing *The Squire's Tale*, for when he read Chaucer's tale, and Spenser's completion of it, he thought that the later poet seemed below himself.[64] Yet it was "elegant" to imitate Chaucer in the introduction to his story. He had Chaucer before him when he wrote "that beautiful description in the first book of Morpheus' house." At III. VI. xxix Spenser should have said "Cythera," but in imitation of Chaucer, Gower, and the Italian poets, here and elsewhere he often gives his proper names a new spelling and a new termination.[65] The edition points out further influences.

Upton mentions Spenser's imitations of Sidney, but in his *Letter* omits to name them. Several are cited in the edition. Braggadocchio, for example, is said to be taken "from the character of the coward Dametas in his favorite Sidney, who creeps into a bush to hide his head from danger"; although the picture of Diana is that "represented in statues or coins, or poetical descriptions," it is likely that he also remembered the Amazonian dress of Pyrochles in Sidney's *Arcadia*.[66] Parallels and linguistic similarities are cited in numerous sources, such as Gower, Surrey, *The Mirror for Magistrates*, *Piers Plowman*, and in *The Court of Love*; and though he makes no real study of the Anglo-Saxon ele-

[63] Cf. p. 79.
[64] *A Letter concerning a new edition of Spenser's Faerie Queene*, 10.
[65] Upton, ii. 455.
[66] *Ibid.*, ii. 444, 445.

ment in Spenser's language, he frequently notes a native derivative of Spenser's word.[67] Warton had studied the sources of Spenser's faeries; Upton often remarks the poet's use of folk-lore, as in his allusion to the annual penance of witches (I. II. xl.).[68]

Upton knew little, however, about the mediaeval romances and liked them less. The *Morte D'Arthur* was " a collection of many French and Italian romances, put together with no art, by one Sir Thomas Maleor." [69] Though he nowhere states his obligation, Warton's *Observations on the Faerie Queene* (1754) directed his attention to a closer study of the influence of the " old romances "; [70] at the same time, when opportunity was offered, Upton credited a deeper indebtedness to the chronicles, and correctly too, particularly in the instance of the *Morte D'Arthur*.[71] He was chagrined that Geoffrey of Monmouth should have inserted tales from " silly romances "; but his strong penchant for history—witness his keen interest in the historical allegory—made him regard Geoffrey with considerable admiration. He assumed that Geoffrey was the poet's chief source. In a note on II. X. xxxiv, he indicates that Spenser's account of " Brutus and his sacred progeny, is taken chiefly from Jeffry of Monmouth." [72] Then

[67] *Ibid.*, ii. 408, etc.

[68] *Ibid.*, ii. 360. Cf. p. 129.

[69] *Ibid.*, ii. 656.

[70] In his *Letter* to West (1751), he had neglected the mediaeval romances to point out a possible indebtedness to Heliodorus [17]. An anonymous pamphlet, *An Impartial Estimate of the Reverend Mr. Upton's Notes on the Fairy Queen* (London, 1759), attacked Upton for borrowing from Warton without acknowledgment.

[71] Warton ascribed Spenser's story of the mantle made of the beards of knights and locks of ladies to the *Morte D'Arthur*, though he recalled that both Geoffrey and Drayton record such a tale. Upton refers only to the two latter. Cf. p. 128.

[72] Upton, ii. 490.

follows a summary of Geoffrey's chronicle. Afterwards in a note on II. X. xlix, Upton gives a second summary. His real purpose was again not to trace sources, but to explain and criticize the poet's verses; hence he cites Geoffrey to show that Spenser's statements are not the fancies of the poet's mind, but matters of common knowledge, and in some cases representations of actual facts. The editor is therefore led to cite quotations and parallels not only from works that preceded Spenser's, but from those that followed it. In a note on the famous wall of the Picts, mentioned in II. X. lxiii, he refers the reader to Geoffrey of Monmouth, Bede, Camden's *Britannia*, and Gordon's *Itinerarium septentrionale*, and, alluding to the " three hoyes of Saxons " who came to the aid of the Britons against the Picts, cites Gildas. Geoffrey, Holinshed, and Milton's history of England are cited for II. X. xxiv; *The Mirror for Magistrates*, Holinshed, and likewise Stowe, for stanza xliii in the same book and canto; Johnannes Ross and Geoffrey for III. III. xxxii. He remarks the original of the fabulous tradition of Uther's transformation into the person of Gorlois, (" a fable like that of Jupiter and Alcmena,") in Buchanan's *Rerum Historia Scoticarum*, but also cites Carew's *Survey of Cornwall* and the *Morte D'Arthur*.[73] Upton's was the first detailed study of Spenser's debt to the chronicles.

As Professor Edwin Greenlaw later,[74] Upton recognized that Spenser intended to emphasize the return of the Arthurian line in the Tudors: in a note on III. III. xlviii, he says, " by the accession of Henry of Richmond to the crown, the prophecy of Merlin and of Cadwallader " that " Briton blood should reign again

[73] *Ibid.*, ii. 535.
[74] Cf. *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory*, especially 1-58.

in Britain" came to be fulfilled.[75] But Upton saw no political significance in *Mother Hubberds Tale*. This poem was not among those "former writs" which had brought the poet "into a mighty Peres displeasure." Its satire was general.[76]

"Great masters borrow, and what they borrow they make their own: little wits steal, and make an unnatural kind of mixture by their stealth"; when Spenser borrowed from Ariosto and Tasso and when Milton borrowed from Spenser, Upton says that it was not poverty that put them upon borrowing, but a love of imitation, and a desire of rivalship.[77] Spenser himself suggested his imitation and rivalry of Ariosto, so that early scholars and editors were not slow in pointing them out, and frequently were not hesitant to lament them. Upton followed them in illustrating in his edition possible sources and parallels in the *Orlando Furioso*. But even before, he had written to West:

> Among the books that our poet consulted *Ariosto* and *Tasso* ought not to be overlooked. From the former is taken all that description of Prince *Authur's* shield, . . . with its amazing effect: and the Squier's bugle horn . . . *Britomart's* enchanted spear, is the golden lance of *Bradamant*: *Brigliadore* is the name of *Orlando's*, as well as *Guyon's* horse: the whole tale of *Geneura* . . . is imitated in the Second Book, Canto IV. and the tale of the *Squire of Dames* in the Faery Queen is imaged from the Host's tale in *Orlando Furioso.*
>
> From *Tasso's* inchanted Island to which Rinaldo arrives, is taken the description of the floating island. . . . And more particularly *Acrasia's* bower.

Tasso moreover "pointed out the allegory" especially

[75] Upton, ii. 537.
[76] *Ibid.*, ii. 657. Cf. pp. 26, 27, 28, 49, 50, 141, 152-153.
[77] Upton, ii. 509.

of the second book, Archimago and Acrasia being imitated from his Ismen and Armida; Spenser, in fact, "translated" Tasso literally in many passages.[78] In the edition further poetic details are identified in the *Jerusalem Delivered* and in the *Aminta*, as well as in Berni, Boccaccio,[79] and Dante. Notice of imitations from the last is significant because Dante was not commonly read in the eighteenth century.[80] Thus, Errour's den (I. I. xiii) is said to be imaged from that of Echidna in Hesiod, but it is "very plain" that Spenser had Dante's Fraud in view when he described Errour. As "he forward moou'd," Ignaro's "wrincled" face "backward still was turnd" (I. VIII. xxxi), after the manner of the soothsayers and augurs in the *Inferno*. Nor was Petrarch forgotten. But in remarking the Mask of Cupid, the editor notes that both Spenser and Petrarch imitated the "triumphal chariot of Cupid with his captives so prettily imaged" in Ovid.[81]

Upton was interested in Spenser's method of work. He thought that certain of the earlier poems were "worked into" the *Faerie Queene*: the Mask of Cupid written in the poet's "younger days with the title of Pageants" was "with proper alterations" embodied in his greater poem; likewise his earlier version of the Bridal of the Medway and Thames.[82] The editor was also aware that Spenser hints that he may treat of Arthur as a king in a second epic or "Heroic Poem . . . the chief subject" of which would have been

[78] *A Letter concerning a new edition of Spenser's Faerie Queene*, 16-17, 5.

[79] Cf. p. 92.

[80] But the Richardsons had noted Milton's indebtedness to Dante (1734). See *Milton's Editors and Commentators*, 105.

[81] Upton, ii. 576.

[82] *Ibid.*, ii. 576, 604.

" the wars of the King and Queen of Fairy Land (now governed by Arthur and Gloriana) against the Paynim King," the " chief Captains " being " those Fairy Knights, whom already he had brought us acquainted with " and the historical intent alluding to the wars Elizabeth waged with Spain.[83] He was at pains to discover that Spenser's spring-headed hydras, sea-shouldering whales, and other " monstrous appearances " in the twelfth canto of the second book were not the fictions of the poet's brain, but drawn from books which he had consulted, from Gesner and Olaus Magnus.[84] Though he was assured that most of the difficulties in the poet's verse could be explained, the flowers in the Garden of Proserpina gave the editor " a deal of trouble," samnitis in particular, till he remembered that it was Spenser's manner to confound neighbour nations and concluded that samnitis must be the " Savine-tree, *arbor* SABINA," the Samnites and Sabines being used thus " promiscuously, according to the licence of poetry." But Spenser usually acts as a scholar and a poet should, that is, to see what others have said on the same subject, and then to imitate what best suits his purpose.[85] He never thinks himself tied down to exactness in minute matters, however, as exemplified in his description of the priests in " Isis Church " (V. VII. iv), who should be represented according to Egyptian custom and are clad in linen, yet have the long locks, not of Egyptian priests, who were bald, but as " ordered " in the prophet Ezekiel.[86] At III. XI. xxix, Spenser had his eye on the fabulous amours and metamorphoses of the gods, as represented in the

[83] *Ibid.*, i. xxiv.
[84] *Ibid.*, ii. 503.
[85] *Ibid.*, ii. 350.
[86] *Ibid.*, ii. 621.

tapestry woven by Arachne in her contest with Minerva, in Ovid.[87]

The editor remarks the poet's frequent ellipses, his repeated omission of the article, pronoun, and verb, a mannerism which Upton opines that he adopted from the " learned languages," and of which the editor does not altogether disapprove because such expressions " delay a reader, and make him think a little." [88] He particularly admires the poet's figures from common life, which contribute variety and relief from the " terrible and more glaring images." He thinks that Vida would have been offended by Spenser's " cloud of combrous gnattes " (I. I. xxiii), but in his own estimation the poet's figure is very " picturesque," [89] a fly or a gnat being as good in comparison or illustration as an ant or a bee upon which Vida looked with favor.[90]

" Elegant " and " picturesque " are Upton's favorite epithets. Thus the simile " like to that heauenly sparke " (VI. VII. vii) is " elegant, and borrowed from Homer." It is " hardly possible for a more picturesque description to come from a poet or painter " than the " whole magical scene " at I. I. xxxix. Spenser might have been more poetical had he said " That o'er his greaves in blood " instead of " That ouer shoes in bloud " (I. VIII. xvi), this expression being " too mean for Epick poetry "; yet, " no one had ever such a power of raising visions and images, as Spenser." [91] He was " unrivalled in the visionary art of bringing objects before . . . [the reader's eyes], and making . . . [him]

[87] Cf. p. 135.

[88] Upton, ii. 355.

[89] A newly fashionable word. See Christopher Hussey's *The Picturesque* (London, New York, 1927); especially, 44-50.

[90] Upton, ii. 344.

[91] *Ibid.*, ii. 395, 403.

a spectator of his imaginary representations." [92] In this he was akin to Homer!

The editor notices the poet's use of suspense and humor. By describing Disdaine and delaying to announce his name, Spenser stimulates the reader's interest and introduces his figure with greater solemnity.[93] There is something humorous in the poet's grouping various fantastical beings, " Apes, Lions, Aegles . . . fooles, louers . . . Dames," such " as are described by whimiscal poets and lying travellers . . . not as Nature frames "! [94] None of Shakespeare's characters is more naturally painted than the three kinds of cowards in III. X.[95]

Upton's intense dislike of rhyme, as revealed both in his notes and in his preface, made him wholly unappreciative of the delicate intricacies and excellencies of the Spenserian stanza. To him it was the stave of the Italians with an additional line of six feet " tacked on " as evidence that Spenser was not a servile imitator. For the sake of rhyme, however, the poet had sacrificed sense, perspicuity, and poetry. Infrequent hemistichs were introduced perhaps, after the manner of Virgil, to break the monotony of the rhymes; but the paucity of these half-verses suggested that the poet had planned finally to complete them.[96] Spenser's rhymes, like Proserpina's flowers, gave the editor trouble. " Wicked rhymes," he says, " to mislead so excellent a poet! " and cause " false spelling." [97] But Upton liked alliteration almost as much as he objected to rhyme. " The whyles his Lord in siluer slomber lay " (VI. VII. xix) was " prettily melted and softened down

[92] *Ibid.*, i. xxxii.
[93] *Ibid.*, ii. 646.
[94] *Ibid.*, ii. 486.
[95] *Ibid.*, ii. 570.
[96] *Ibid.*, i. xxxiii-xxxv.
[97] *Ibid.*, ii. 365, 403.

by the repetition of the letter *l*." A reader was very inattentive not to observe a thousand instances of this same "iteration of letters," which the editor found "really pretty." [98] In view of his disapproval of the Spenserian stanza it is not surprising, however, that "in the power and harmony of numbers," Upton gave the preference to Homer, Virgil, and Milton. Spenser's diction was more highly regarded, because in affecting "an antique language" the poet had imitated Homer, who had "introduced many terminations, and many an antiquated word and spelling from the old Ionian, not then in vulgar use . . . just as Spenser . . . chose many Saxon and obsolete words and spellings, to give . . . [his] poems the venerable cast of antiquity." [99]

Upton's biography contributes few new facts. The editor's scepticism as to traditionary tales of the poet and his suggestion that Spenser may have gone to northern England as "a tutor to some young gentlemen" are, however, of considerable interest. "'Tis plain . . . from many passages in his Pastorals," that Spenser often visited at Penshurst, where he studied poetry and philosophy with Sidney and wrote the October and November eclogues of the *Calender*.[100] Upton conjectures that the poet fell under the displeasure of Leicester for "some kind of officious sedulity" growing out of Spenser's desire to see his patron marry the queen.[101] But he was convinced that the poet made a journey to France in the Earl's behalf. He rejects the anecdote of Sidney's admiration of the Despair canto, and though he cites Fenton's account, he is not wholly

[98] *Ibid.*, ii. 646, 391 (second 391, see n. 11, p. 76).
[99] *Ibid.*, i. xxxii-xxxiii.
[100] *Ibid.*, i. xv. Cf. p. 91.
[101] *Ibid.*, i. xvi-xvii.

assured that Cambridge did not " prove a stepmother " to Spenser in the matter of a fellowship. He approves the reason-rime story because it is not inconsistent as to time or place.[102] On the evidence given in the *Amoretti* (sonnets lx and lxxiv) and the *Epithalamion* (ll. 264-5), Upton suggests that very probably in 1588 or 89, Spenser " had some thoughts " of " a countrey lasse," (VI. X. xxv) who had the same name as the queen and his own mother, and whom he afterwards courted in earnest and married on June 11, 1592 or 1593.[103] This, he says, was " that faire one " celebrated by Spenser as the fourth grace in the sixth book. In Mirabella of the *Faerie Queene* (VI. VIII) Upton sees Rosalind of the *Calender* " plainly characterized." [104]

Professor F. J. Child said that the student of Spenser was more indebted to Upton " than to any other writer for elucidations of obscure passages " in the *Faerie Queene*, " particularly in the allegory, and for curious expositions of the authors whom Spenser had read or has imitated." [105] Certainly he was easily the greatest of the eighteenth-century editors, and was surpassed only by Warton as a commentator.

A Text for the Common Reader

The second annotated text of the *Faerie Queene* was the work of Ralph Church, " Late Student of *Christ Church, Oxon.*" whose name was " wholly unknown to the learned World." [106] The first volume contains a

[102] *Ibid.*, i. vii. [103] *Ibid.*, i. xix. [104] Cf. p. 87, n. 46.
[105] *Poetical Works,* ed. F. J. Child (Boston, 1855), i. iv.
[106] *Faerie Queene*, ed. Church, i. A_2. He was vicar of Pyrton and Shirburne, and perhaps tutor to the children of the Earl of Macclesfield; hence his dedication to Lady Parker.

dedication to the Vicountess Parker, which announces that the work was chiefly intended for the use and entertainment of the "Fair Sex";[107] a preface describing previous editions; an account of the poet's life written by a friend of the editor; the letter to Raleigh and verses prefixed to Spenser's quartos; a page of symbols identifying the editions referred to in the notes; a glossary; the text of the first book; and a list of errors of the press. The other volumes comprise text and separate errata.[108]

An account of previous editions illustrates that a new *Faerie Queene* was among the "wants" of the time. Not unlike Upton's account[109] but more detailed, this is important for noticing certain large differences in the poet's quartos, the variation in the two dedications, the number of prefatory poems, the two endings of the third book, and the presence or omission of the letter to Raleigh. The editor erred, however, in calling the first two editions octavos.

Owing to "the very small number of *Errata* (comparatively speaking) which were . . . noted, and the gross blunders which were overlooked," Church was convinced that Spenser had had no concern in correcting the first quarto, and lamented "that neither *Spenser* nor any judicious Friend was concerned in the care of that *second* Impression," in which many of the

[107] Upton's edition was dedicated to Lady Talbot.

[108] During much of the printing, the first volume of the second quarto was inaccessible to Church, but later securing a copy, he rechecked his lections, and for the convenience of the reader brought all the errors of the press together in the last volume, in view of the editor's objective, a fact of some note. The fourth volume also includes a postscript, and a list of subscribers with the names of Garrick, Thomas Warton, Dodsley, the bookseller, and numerous ladies, the frequency of the last being accounted for, perhaps, in the dedication.

[109] See p. 78.

errata of the first edition " (tho' some of them very valuable ones) are overlooked and not amended," and in which there are no tables of errata, giving occasion thereby to certain difficulties which he thought could " not easily be removed." [110] Some care was taken with the first folio, but according to Church, unhappily directed to a wrong object, for in attempting to clear and settle the text the " Managers " of the edition only clogged and perplexed it by adding " many thousand stops " and, presuming that the last impression of the three first books was most correct, printed from that without consulting the first. Like Birch, Church was inclined to underrate the second quarto. He was quite right, however, in thinking that the editor of the first folio made little or no use of the first quarto, but regarding the punctuation modern editors might disagree with him.[111] The next folio (1611) was " not so fair " but had " some good words," probably suggested by Gabriel Harvey or some intimate friend then living. Evidence of Church's accuracy appears in his detecting Lownes's artifice as to the *Faerie Queene* in 1617.[112] He is no less observant of issues in the eighteenth century. With the exception of orthographical changes, Hughes's text is discovered to be, in general, a transcript of the first folio (1609); the editor of the reprint introduced " some few Amendments " from the quartos, but erred in printing the first ending of the third book; [113] the merit of Birch's work was left to the decision of the reader; the more recent Tonson octavo, however, was admitted to be a servile copy of the reprint of Hughes's issue.[114] Church's conclusion

[110] Church, i. iii-iv.
[111] Cf. p. 3.
[112] Cf. p. 7.
[113] Church, i. viii-ix.
[114] *Ibid.*, i. ix.

is discouraging: as the number of editions had increased, the text had become proportionally more precarious.[115]

The editor's own work was characterized by a singleness of aim in producing an accurate text. With that end his energies were chiefly directed to collating the earliest and later issues, and to recording variant readings in the notes appended to each page of the text. He did not expect a perfect edition, for a "faultless" reprint of so long a poem was not reasonably to be expected from any man; the best, in fact, would have its failings.[116] If his own, upon the whole, at all contributed to the entertainment of the reader, by introducing him to a more intimate acquaintance with a poem "which had hitherto been the Delight and Admiration of Men of the finest Taste," he would think that his pains were not ill-bestowed. Like Birch and Upton, he took the earlier quarto as standard for the first three books, the second for the last books, and for the *Mutabilitie* cantos, the first folio.[117] In registering his disapproval of the modernizations characteristic of Hughes's text, Church asserts that he himself had taken care to retain "altogether" the antiquated spelling of the poet's quartos. He would as readily change the drapery in Spenser's picture as alter his venerable language.[118] A correction of "chaw" to "jaw" (I. IV. xxx. 4), after the reading of the first folio, and similar emendations refute his statement. Moreover, he prefers in some instances lections found only in the third folio and later versions. He boasts, however, that no word differing from his standards was inserted in the text "knowingly and designedly, with-

[115] *Ibid.*, i. A_2.
[116] *Ibid.*, i. ix.
[117] *Ibid.*, i. xii, x.
[118] *Ibid.*, i. 143. Cf. p. 16.

out giving notice of it," and hardly exaggerates his accuracy, although his departures are often no less inexcusable.[119] His collations are more meticulous than those of Birch, or even Upton, such errors as occur arising chiefly from his failure to notice corrections in Birch's errata. Lections from unauthentical reprints appear too frequently for his text to be thoroughly sound;[120] nevertheless the poem is far more adequately presented than in any edition in the eighteenth century prior to 1759.

Church's emendations are sensible rather than Spenserian. On the authority of a passage in Genesis (ii. xi), he would alter, "Gehons" to "Phisons" in "Gehons golden waues" (I. VII. xliii. 9). Upton proposed the same change, but objected to it because he thought that the poet was attracted by the alliteration in the accepted reading, certainly a sufficiently Spenserian reason.[121] Sense supports Church's conjectures, and alliteration favors the text again, at I. IX. xxxii. 7 and VI. VII. xlix. 9, where it is suggested that "gold or fee" and "swords" be substituted for "gold nor glee" and "words." Sense dictates the distinction between "Sabaoth" (hosts) and "Sabbath" (rest) at VII. VIII. ii. 8-9, but whether the poet intended such a distinction could hardly be determined by the differences in the spellings of the folios. Church was himself sufficiently convinced to introduce "Sabbath's sight," and Todd imitated him. Mr. J. C. Smith thinks that there is "much to be said" for a conjecture at II. I. lviii. 4, where for the sake of contrast, Church would

[119] *Ibid.*, i. x.

[120] To cite only I. III. xxxii. 9, VI. xxxviii. 2, X. vii. 9; II. I. xxviii. 3; III. XI. xxiii. 2; IV. V. iv. 4, VIII. lxiv. 1; V. XI. xl. 6, etc.

[121] Upton, ii. 391 (second 391, see n. 11, p. 76).

emend "fry in hartlesse griefe" to "frieze"[122] or "frize."[123] Mr. Smith's "fryze" is a more suggestive spelling, however.[124] Britomart, addressing her "guilty eyes," says

> I wote when ye did watch both night and day
> Vnto your losse . . .
> Now will ye sleepe? ah wake, and rather weepe,
> To thinke of your nights want, that should yee
> waking keepe [V. VI. xxv].

Church objects both to the wording and the punctuation of the passage. He would emend to "Knight's want" and punctuate as follows:

> ——— ——— Ah! wake, and rather weepe
> To thinke of your *Knight's* want! That should
> yee waking keepe.

Here again the conjecture is more sensible than Spenserian and the alteration in punctuation perhaps too dramatic. The editor was obviously correct in emending "meed" (V. XI. lxi. 7) to "hire" or "hyre," for the former could hardly rhyme with "yre." He thought that Spenser purposely left the hemistich at II. VIII. lv. 9 unfinished, and, not being of the opinion that the poet was concerned in the care of the second quarto, ascribed the one at III. VI. xxvi. 4, to another hand than Spenser's.[125]

Church gave especial care to the punctuation and pronunciation of the text. Spenser is said to have been "not always exact," but much of his "supposed want of Construction" is to be attributed to "the almost

[122] As at xlii. 3.
[123] As at VI. X. xxxiii. 9.
[124] *Faerie Queene,* ed. Oxford, ii. 505.
[125] Church, ii. 164; iii. 132.

numberless Blunders and false pointings" of all former editions.[126] Church's own version, however, is over-punctuated, and much too frequently broken by semicolons when commas would suffice.[127] He believed that Spenser never intended to make every stanza a distinct paragraph, but found only two instances to support his theory.[128] He attentively notes accentuation and division of syllables, uncommon usages, and difficult expressions.

Like the dedication, the annotations indicate that the edition was primarily intended for the general reader; for, although Church states that what little assistance he has offered is "submitted likewise to the Judgment of *the Learned*" (of whose indulgence he did not despair), his notes are planned "principally to help the common *English* Reader, as far as might be done with brevity."[129] He was therefore not interested in the citation of classical sources or parallels as were Jortin and Upton. In fact, he confesses that it was no part of his scheme "to introduce Quotations from the Dead Languages, which must be disagreeable to the *English* Reader."[130] So practical an attitude produced notes chiefly textual and glossarial. Yet Church speaks of Spenser as seldom losing sight of Virgil,[131] points out Biblical allusions and influences,[132] cites similar passages in Chaucer and Milton,[133] and notes that the Bower of Bliss was taken from Tasso.[134] He reviews Phineas

[126] *Ibid.*, iv. 131.
[127] See especially III. V. xlvii. 8-9.
[128] Church, i. 6.
[129] *Ibid.*, i. xii; ii. 142.
[130] *Ibid.*, ii. 136.
[131] *Ibid.*, ii. 296.
[132] *Ibid.*, i. 22, 57, 63, 113, 181, 183, 185, 187; iii. 59, 408, 410, etc.
[133] *Ibid.*, i. 23; ii. 124, 131, 194; iii. 121, etc.
[134] *Ibid.*, ii. 294.

Fletcher's indebtedness and tributes to Spenser,[135] and shows considerable interest in comparable material from the chronicles, pointing out references in Geoffrey of Monmouth,[136] Robert of Gloucester,[137] Robert of Brunne,[138] John Hardying,[139] and later historical writers, such as Verstegen, Milton, Sammes, and Borlase.[140] His allusions to Drayton's *Polyolbion* and Selden's notes to the poem are unusually numerous and helpful. For definitions he often depended upon the glossary to Urry's *Chaucer*, Blount's *Glossographia* and *Law Dictionary*, Junius's *Etymologicum Anglicanum*, and Ray's *Collection of English Words*. He is the first editor to emphasize that Spenser's invocation is addressed to Clio,[141] Upton having wavered between Clio and Calliope. He explains that Una was an Irish proper name for women; thus suggests a source for the name of the heroine of the first book, in whom he sees Queen Elizabeth " typically represented." [142] He cautions the reader to remember that the poem is " a continued allegorie," and though he thinks that Longinus would have condemned Spenser for the strength of his painting at I. I. xx, VIII. xlvii-xlviii, and in like passages, he applauds the poet's moral intention in the conventional manner by sighing for just such representations to check " the encrease of that enormous Brood of *Error* and *Falshood* which swarms in our streets." [143]

[135] *Ibid.*, ii. 124, etc.
[136] *Ibid.*, ii. 197, 203, 210, 211, 214; iii. 62, 65, etc.
[137] *Ibid.*, ii. 196, 199, 207, 208, 210, etc.
[138] *Ibid.*, ii. 207, 212, 233, etc.
[139] *Ibid.*, i. 3; ii. 198, 203, 205, 206, 211, etc.
[140] *Ibid.*, ii. 194, etc.; ii. 195, 208, etc.; ii. 195, 200, 201, 203, etc.; ii. 220, 222, etc.
[141] *Ibid.*, i. 1.
[142] *Ibid.*, i. 28.
[143] *Ibid.*, i. 10-11.

The anonymous biographer of Church's edition believed that Spenser wrote "most" of the *Faerie Queene* in Ireland, that the poet made "rough draughts" and "some parts perhaps writ of all the books," and only as new incidents arose interwove them.[144] Church himself was not of the opinion that the *Mutabilitie* cantos were intended particularly for the seventh book.[145] He suggests that the last six books perished "with several other lesser Poems (whose Names only are come down to us) in the confusion when *Spenser's* House was plundered and burnt by the *Irish* Rebels," and now are "irrecoverably lost."[146] The six books and several cantos which remained, however, would live and be admired in one copy or another—whatever fate befell his own edition—"till that, and all other human Compositions, shall perish together in *the last general Conflagration.*" Elsewhere in referring to Jortin's praise of certain lines, Church says,

> The judicious Reader will discover a thousand passages that deserve to be admir'd: and should he meet with some less shining ones, in which the Poet may seem to nod, it is not to be wonder'd at, considering the uncommon length of the Poem.[147]

For one fault that may be found in it, Church would undertake to point out "a hundred *Beauties*." Yet, however much he admired the *Faerie Queene*, he was little concerned as to its Gothic character. Hughes and Warton might have stimulated his interest in this aspect of the poem, but he neglected the prefatory essays

[144] *Ibid.*, i. xxiv.
[145] *Ibid.*, iv. 417.
[146] The anonymous biographer relates Ware's story of the lost books, but Church does not refer to this authority [i. xl; iv. 462].
[147] Church, ii. 142.

of the one, and at no time refers to the other. He was an accurate, practical, somewhat moralistic editor, dominated by one definite, excellent objective.

The anonymous biography contributes further information as to Spenser's social "alliances," with regard particularly to "Phillis, Charillis, and sweet Amarillis" (identified as the second, fifth, and sixth daughters of Sir John Spencer of Althorpe) and their marital relationships; Helen, Marchioness of Northampton, and her niece, Lady Douglas Howard; Gabriel Harvey, and especially, "Rosalind" of the *Shepheardes Calender*, whom the author's "imperfect guesses" would identify as "Rose Lynde," "Rose" being a very common Christian name, and "Lynde" a surname among the gentry in Canterbury in the reign of Henry VI.[148] An attempt is also made to identify the original home of the Poet's family. Dean, Cherwellon, Dingley, and Easton in Northampton are suggested as more likely locations, owing to their having furnished high sheriffs of the name from the time of Edward VI.[149] The poet's birth is again placed "about the year 1553"; the old story of his application for a fellowship is rejected; the facts of his relationship with Burleigh, as given in the editions of Hughes and Birch, are retold, but nothing of importance is added; the biographer suggests that Spenser's journey to France "never took place," that Sidney recommended him to Lord Grey, and that the combined interest of the Sidneys and Grey secured his land grant. The course of the poet's successful love and marriage is traced in the *Amoretti* and *Epithalamion*, the account of his death and funeral given according to Camden, Ware, and Jonson, and information regarding his descendants drawn chiefly from

[148] *Ibid.*, i. xx.

[149] *Ibid.*, i. xviii-xix.

Birch's biography. The author quotes Fenton as to the poet's monument and cites Phineas Fletcher's repeated tributes.[150]

Biographical facts are interrupted by comments on various poems. Attention is directed to the "fine morality" of the *Faerie Queene*, and notice taken that allegorical allusions to the poet's friends and patrons are more frequent "than as yet has been observed." [151] The *Complaints* are "little things, done when *Spenser* was young, according to the taste of the time for Emblems," *Virgils Gnat* in particular being commended as a masterly translation.[152] The biographer corrects the mistake in the name of the Countess of Warwick in the dedication to the *Fowre Hymnes*, and is considerably concerned as to the date of the composition of *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*. Assured that the date of the dedication to the poem is wrong, he produces evidence to show that 1591 "must be a mistake for December 27, 1595." [153] The similarity in style and method to a life of Drayton contributed anonymously to an edition of this poet in 1748, but admittedly the work of William Oldys, suggests, I think, that Oldys may have written the biography of Spenser in Church's edition of the *Faerie Queene*.

[150] *Ibid.*, i. xli-xliii.
[151] *Ibid.*, i. xxv.
[152] *Ibid.*, i. xxv, xxvi. Cf. p. 57.
[153] *Ibid.*, i. xxx-xxxii.

CHAPTER FIVE

STUDIES IN SPENSER'S SOURCES

CHAPTER FIVE

STUDIES IN SPENSER'S SOURCES

Thomas Warton's *Observations on the Faerie Queene* was published in 1754 in one volume. Eight years later (1762) a second edition, "corrected and enlarged," appeared in two volumes.[1] The second not only contains additional material, including a digression of fourteen pages on Gothic architecture, an indebtedness to Upton's *Faerie Queene*,[2] and numerous allusions to Milton and other poets, but is more romantic in tone than the first. Postscripts to the two editions suggest that the commentary might have been more useful had it been printed with Spenser's text. The desultory nature of his mind and his antiquarian fondness for collecting scattered notes on subjects that especially interested him made Warton loathe to undertake the unified whole which an edition demanded.[3] His purpose was to give "a clear and comprehensive estimate of the characteristical merits and manner" of an admired, but neglected, poet.[4] To further this purpose, he considered the customs and genius of the poet's age, searched his contemporary writers, and examined the books on which the peculiarities of his style, taste, and composition were confessedly founded.[5]

[1] In this study, volume references distinguish the second from the first edition.

[2] Notably in the eleventh section, where Warton points out an allusion to Raleigh identified earlier by Upton [ii. 179]. See also p. 86.

[3] Warton says that he was chiefly dissuaded from such a procedure by two anticipated editions [ii. 262].

[4] *Observations on the Faerie Queene,* ii. 263-264.

[5] A letter from Dr. Johnson to Warton indicates that Warton intended a commentary on the minor poems but was prevented by his tutorial duties from its accomplishment. Johnson wrote,

> I am glad of your hindrance in your Spenserian design, yet I

The eleven sections of the commentary concern the plan and conduct of the *Faerie Queene*, Spenser's imitations from the mediaeval romances, his "use and abuse of ancient history and mythology," his stanza, versification, and language, his imitations from Chaucer and from Ariosto, his inaccuracies, his imitations of himself, the author's criticism of Upton's opinion as to several passages in Spenser, the poet's allegorical character, and miscellaneous remarks. In them lies Warton's threefold contribution as critic, devotee, and antiquary.

Warton's criticism of the plan and conduct of the *Faerie Queene* is remarkably like that of Hughes, only more elaborate, more thorough, and, at the same time, more vacillating. He appropriated Hughes's method by beginning with a brief résumé of romantic poetry.[6] "When the works of Homer and of Aristotle began to be restored and studied in Italy . . . it was reasonable to conclude, that unnatural events, the machinations of imaginary beings, and adventures entertaining only as they were improbable, would have given place to justness of thought and design, and to that decorum

would not have it delayed. Three hours a day stolen from sleep and amusement will produce it [Boswell's *Johnson,* ed. Hill, i. 276].

Further evidence is intimated in Warton's copy of the 1617 folio now at the British Museum. This volume contains copious manuscript notes which subsequently formed the basis for his *Observations* but which also continue partly through the minor poems. Warton's interest in Spenser did not cease, however, for many years later, when concerned with Malone's plan for an edition of Shakespeare, he mentioned, among other material he expected to be useful to Malone, Spenser's dedicatory sonnet to the *Historie of George Castriot* and transcribed portions from the manuscripts of Wood and Aubrey with reference to Spenser and other poets [Clarissa Rinaker, *Thomas Warton. A Biographical and Critical Study* (1916) 158].

[6] Cf. Blackmore's résumé, p. 38, n. 21.

which nature dictated, and which the example and the precept of antiquity had authorised." [7] But a "more legitimate taste of writing" was not effected for a long time because Ariosto rejected truth for magic. When "in the midst of this bad taste," [8] Spenser began the *Faerie Queene*, after the practice of Ariosto, he fashioned it of allegories, enchantments, and romantic expeditions.

The poet might have followed Tasso, who had exceeded Ariosto in conduct and decorum, but he was misled by literary traditions into imitating that design which he thought "would admit of the most extensive range for his unbounded imagination." [9] Spenser did not altogether depart from classical precedent, however, for in "establishing one hero, who, seeking and attaining one grand end . . . , should exemplify one grand character, or a brave Knight perfected in the twelve moral virtues," he copied the cast and construction of the ancient epic. He did not, in the meantime, seem convinced of the necessity of that unity of action, by means of which such a design should be properly accomplished; at any rate, he did not follow the method practiced by Homer and Virgil, in conducting their heroes to the proposed end.[10] Prince Arthur was to attain complete possession of glory by lending his respective assistance to each of the twelve knights. But assisting was not a sufficient service for the prince. The poet ought to have made his brave knight the

[7] *Observations,* i. 1-2.

[8] The second edition modifies the adjective to "prevailing."

[9] *Observations,* 3. In conceding, in the second edition, that of the two poets Ariosto was Spenser's favorite, Warton was less discerning than Hughes. Cf. p. 44. The *Faerie Queene,* however, "is not so confused and irregular as the Orlando Furioso" [i. 12].

[10] *Ibid.*, i. 6.

leading adventurer. This is noticeably not unlike Hughes's discovery that Arthur's share was not considerable enough in any legend.[11] On the whole, the twelve knights do too much for Arthur to do anything; hence " that magnanimity . . . which is the true character of Prince Arthur," and shines, according to Dryden, " throughout the whole poem," in Warton's opinion bursts forth but seldom, and then in obscure and interrupted flashes.[12]

The adventures have not always " a mutual dependence upon each other, and consequently do not properly contribute to constitute one legitimate poem," whereas the *Faerie Queene*, considered as an epic, should be compounded of many various parts, not one of which " should be so regularly contrived, and so completely finished, as to become a WHOLE of itself." [13] The poet's efforts to satisfy this want of general unity are not wholly successful; for his first method—that of resuming and finishing in some distant book a tale formerly begun and left imperfect—often occasions infinite perplexity to his reader; and his second—that of introducing one of his twelve knights in some less dangerous exploit after he has achieved his proper adventure in another book—sullies the lustre of a knight's former victories.[14] Spenser " would have embarrassed himself and the reader less, had he made every book one entire detached poem of twelve cantos, without any reference to the rest." He would then have written " twelve different books, in each of which he might have com-

[11] See pp. 44-45.

[12] *Observations*, i. 7.

[13] *Ibid.*, i. 8. Thus Warton would invalidate Hughes's statement that the first book as an entire work of itself is no irregular contrivance. See p. 44.

[14] *Ibid.*, i. 9.

pleted the pattern of a particular virtue in twelve Knights respectively." In endeavouring to represent all the virtues exemplified in one, the poet failed. He might more effectively have established twelve knights without an Arthur, or an Arthur without twelve knights.[15] Warton judges the first plan the better, the second defective as it necessarily wants simplicity. *A Letter . . . to . . . Raleigh* suggests that the reader was to learn in a final book that various adventures undertaken in the course of the poem were at the command of the Faery Queen and were severally begun on her annual birthday festival, but Spenser in most of the books has injudiciously forestalled the first of these particulars. Less variation from historical precision would have furthered the unity.

The general breakdown in esthetic standards around the middle of the eighteenth century was followed by a noticeably greater understanding of the Gothic, or complex, structure in art. At the same time—beginning about 1760—there was also a process under way of re-interpreting Greek art, rendering it closer in spirit to the Gothic *diableries*.[16] Evidence of this increased understanding is particularly apparent in Richard Hurd's *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* (1762), in which he interprets the *Faerie Queene* as a Gothic poem based not on unity of action, but of design.[17] Hurd says,

> When an architect examines a Gothic structure by Grecian rules, he finds nothing but deformity. But the Gothic archi-

[15] *Ibid.*, i. 10.

[16] See E. N. Hooker's "The Discussion of Taste, from 1750 to 1770, and the New Trends in Literary Criticism," *PMLA*, XLIX. 577-592.

[17] Richard Hurd, *Letters on Chivalry and Romance*, ed. E. J. Morley, 114-127.

tecture has it's own rules, by which when it comes to be examined, it is seen to have it's merit, as well as the Grecian. The question is not, which of the two is conducted in the simplest or truest taste: but, whether there be not sense and design in both, when scrutinized by the laws on which each is projected.[18]

The same observation, he thinks, holds of the two sorts of poetry, epic and epic-romance: " Judge of the *Faery Queen* by the classic models, and you are shocked with it's disorder: consider it with an eye to it's Gothic original, and you find it regular." Spenser's regard for the classics forced him to affect an appearance of classic unity; he chose one chief character who was to appear throughout the poem.[19] Contrary to the opinion of Upton, Hurd thinks that this expedient was but an afterthought and a poor method by which to conceal the disorder of his Gothic plan.[20] Spenser should have known that classic and Gothic unity could never be reconciled.

Warton's criticism is less stable and less penetrating than Hurd's. He wavers between his fondness for a poet who " makes such perpetual and powerful appeals to the fancy " and his regard for " that decorum which nature dictated, and which the example and the precept of antiquity had authorised." [21] But a more discerning

[18] *Ibid.*, 118.

[19] Cf. Warton, p. 117.

[20] Hurd, 123-124. Cf. Upton, pp. 80-82.

[21] *Observations*, ii. 269; i. 1-2. But many other neo-classicists also admired Greek art (as they knew it), and yet, were fond of Gothic productions. Walpole says, " The Grecian temple is glorious, this I openly worship; in the heretical corner of my heart I adore the Gothic building " [*The Letters of Horace Walpole*, ed. Toynbee, iii. 181]. The loyalties of their minds and hearts were apart. See R. D. Havens's " Thomas Warton and the Eighteenth-Century Dilemma," [*SP*, XXV. 44-46]. But see, also, p. 123.

attitude towards Gothic structure is evident in the conclusion to section one of the second edition of his *Observations* (1762), which includes a significant paragraph not found in the conclusion to this section in the first edition (1754).[22] In his new penultimate paragraph, Warton temporarily abandons neo-classical criteria to confess that " it is absurd to think of judging either Ariosto or Spenser by precepts which they did not attend to." An admission of standards apart from the classic unities, his statement is an excellent blow for the defense of Ariosto and the *Faerie Queene.* It is obviously reminiscent of Hughes but not dissimilar to current trends in Shakespearean criticism.[23] The historical method was taking deeper root; and more than one poet was being studied sympathetically with reference to his age.

As his argument continues, Warton becomes even more liberal. " We who live in the days of writing by rule," he says, " are apt to try every composition by those laws which we have been taught to think the sole criterion of excellence . . . we require the same order and design which every modern performance is expected to have, in poems where they were never regarded or intended "; [24] from which one infers that the neo-classical unities are not the sole criterion of excellence, that lacking the order and design of a modern

[22] Warton's increased interest in Gothic art is also apparent in fourteen additional pages devoted to Gothic architecture. Cf. p. 115.

[23] See pp. 40-41, and cf. " Thomas Warton and the Eighteenth-Century Dilemma," *SP,* XXV. 40-41. Before the turn of the century, critics had begun to lose interest in assailing Shakespeare for breach of a simple unity of action and were stressing unity of character. See R. W. Babcock's *The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry* (Chapel Hill, 1931), 3.

[24] *Observations,* i. 15.

poem, the masterpieces of Ariosto and Spenser may have a place apart from the unities.[25] Then Warton climaxes the matter by stating that the *Faerie Queene* has no plan![26] Like most of the eighteenth century editors, Warton turns readily from research to criticism; not written in an age of planning, Spenser's poetry is " the careless exuberance of a warm imagination and a strong sensibility." Exactness in the *Faerie Queene* would have been like " the cornice which a painter introduced in the grotto of Calypso." That the poem lacks plan, that it is made up of images, " in the formation and disposition of which, little labour or art was applied " is, at least for the time being, of no grave concern to Warton, who in a final paragraph, without altering or disproving his conflicting statements, enthusiastically continues by declaring that

> If the FAIRY QUEEN be destitute of that arrangement and oeconomy which epic severity requires, yet we scarcely regret the loss of these while their place is so amply supplied, by something which more powerfuly attracts us: something, which engages the affections the feelings of the heart, rather than the cold approbation of the head. If there be any poem, whose graces please, because they are situated beyond the reach of art, and where the force and faculties of creative imagination delight, because they are unassisted and unrestrained by those of deliberate judgment, it is this. In reading Spenser if the critic is not satisfied, yet the reader is transported.

[25] Cf. Tasso's theory that there were two sorts of unity possible in art as in nature: the simple unity of a chemical element and the complex unity of an organism like an animal or plant, the second being the sort of unity that the heroic poet should aim at [J. E. Spingarn, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance* (repr. 1930), 119-120]. Cf. Hurd, p. 120.

[26] " Thomas Warton and the Eighteenth-Century Dilemma," *SP*, XXV. 42.

The Augustans had recognized in art a *je ne sais quoi*, a grace beyond the reach of art,[27] and some of them, John Dennis[28] for one, had exalted "transport" before Warton;[29] nevertheless Warton's spontaneity and warmth are splendid, and undoubtedly accentuated the poet's fame. But the devotee has overgone the critic, and Warton identified himself with that group who exert their admiration instead of their reason.[30] Having admitted that the neo-classical unities were not the only criteria, he was obligated as a critic to make a more searching study of the plan of the *Faerie Queene* apart from neo-classical tenets. He did not because he was not primarily a critic but an enthusiastic lover not too gravely disturbed by the inconsistencies of the poem, and secondly and more significantly to the exigencies of Spenserian scholarship, an antiquary. Note the delight with which he announces his discovery of Spenser's indebtedness to the mediaeval romance, *Sir Bevis of Southampton*:

> We feel a sort of malicious triumph in detecting the latent and obscure source, from whence an original author has drawn some celebrated description: yet this, it must be granted, soon gives way to the rapture that naturally results from contemplating the chymical energy of true genius, which can produce so noble a transmutation; and whose virtues are not less efficacious and vivifying in their nature, than those of the miraculous water here displayed by Spenser.[31]

Uncovering old books and manuscripts was Warton's real lust, but because he was young and living in a

[27] Cf. Pope, *An Essay on Criticism*, 1. 153.

[28] Cf. *The Grounds of Criticism* (1704): "Passion is the Characteristical Mark of Poetry, and . . . all Poetry is pathetick" [94].

[29] Cf. Rinaker, 45-46.

[30] *Observations*, ii. 263.

[31] *Ibid.*, i. 54.

critical age, he "touched up" his work with bits of criticism.[32] That he was somewhat concerned about the matter is apparent in his returning to it in his postscript, where he repeats that he has "so far tried" the poem by the epic rules, "as to demonstrate the inconveniences and incongruities, which the poet might have avoided, had he been more studious of design and uniformity." [33]

Warton's preference for the second folio of Spenser's *Works* (1617) indicates his accuracy as regards the text.[34] He was not scrupulous. Reliance upon folio readings to the neglect of the poet's corrections deluded him into emending certain so-called alexandrines, such as that at I. I. xii. v, which Birch had already corrected from "Faults Escaped"; [35] and acceptance of the neoclassical rule of a full pause after the third foot of an alexandrine accounts for his alteration of other verses, such as "Saue Beares, Lions, and Buls" (III. I. xiv) to "Save lyons, beares, and buls." But he was interested in several definitely textual matters. Section seven reviews the poet's inaccuracies, which Warton adjudges

[32] Edwin Greenlaw, *The Province of Literary History* (Baltimore, 1931), 71.

[33] *Observations,* ii. 268. Cf. similar examinations of Macpherson's *Fingal.* See especially the opinions of Hurd and Hugh Blair, and reviews of Blair's *Dissertation concerning the Poems of Ossian* (1762) in the *Critical Review* and the *Monthly Review.* The reviewer for the *Critical* declares that it is as absurd to test *Fingal* by the rules for the epic as "to judge a Lapland jacket by the fashion of an Armenian gaberdine." The critic for *The Monthly* finds it expedient, however, that "the mechanism and execution of every considerable performance should be compared with that standard, and examined by those laws, which have for many ages been allowed to constitute the perfection of that species of writing, under the denomination of which such performance is presented to the world" [*Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson,* 87, 167-169].

[34] See p. 116, n. 5. Warton's lections are drawn from this folio.

[35] See p. 67.

to be chiefly ellipses, confused constructions, tautological and ambiguous expressions, and contradictions of himself, or other absurdities, in consequence of his forgetting or not reviewing what he had previously written. Section eight is devoted to the poet's imitations of himself in order to ascertain his favorite images, show how he expresses the same thought at different times, and explain difficult passages.[36] Section nine considers the emendations which had appeared in Upton's *Critical Observations on Shakespeare* (1746) and *Letter concerning a new edition of Spenser's Faerie Queene* (1751), with proof of the correctness of Spenser's " sent " (I. I. xliii), " dry dropsie " (I. IV. xxiii), " cleene " (I. VII. xxxiii), and similar expressions; which proof, like his study of Spenser's sources, suggests the sundry character of Warton's knowledge, his interest in diction, and his intimacy with earlier literature.[37]

Chaucer's eight-line stave is suggested as a possible new source for Spenser's stanza. Warton's opinion of the poet's choice is otherwise not greatly unlike Hughes's;[38] from " the prolixity of his stanza, and the multitude of his rhymes " often arise " the fullness and significancy " of the poet's descriptions.[39] He is more generous in his criticism of Spenser's style. The poet, in general, has great perspicuity and facility. Jonson's

[36] Cf. Theobald's statement that " every author is best expounded and explain'd in *One* Place, by his own Usage and Manner of Expression in *Others* " [R. B. McKerrow, *The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text by His Earlier Editors* (1933), 23].

[37] Characteristics later exemplified in his edition of Milton's minor poems (1785). Cf. *Milton's Editors and Commentators,* 267-294; and *Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson,* 201-203.

[38] See p. 47.

[39] *Observations,* i. 115-116.

famous censure that Spenser " writ no language " was perhaps unreasonable, for the groundwork and substance of the poet's style was the language of his age strengthened and dignified by various expressions from older poets. For many stanzas together Spenser may be read with as much facility as the same number of lines in Shakespeare.[40]

Jortin had given his days and nights to Spenser's classical reminiscences, others heeding the poet's own suggestion had cited the influence of Ariosto and Chaucer, and John Hughes had very happily designated the poet's debt to chivalry, but only Warton with accuracy and detail had followed his own dictum, that in

> reading the works of a poet who lived in a remote age, . . . We should endeavour to place ourselves in the writer's situation and circumstances . . . to discover, how his turn of thinking, and manner of composing, were influenced by familiar appearances and established objects, . . . utterly different from those with which we are at present surrounded.[41]

Hence his careful study of Spenser's indebtedness to the mediaeval romances, to the moralities and masques popular in Elizabethan times, his detailed and sound account of Spenser's use of Chaucer's ideas and expressions, his catalogues of the poet's imitations of Ariosto, his " use and abuse " of classical history and mythology, and his attention to the influence of architecture and tapestry upon the *Faerie Queene*. He had chosen the method of Hughes and Theobald. His accomplishment becomes all the more remarkable when we recall that mediaeval romances, moralities, and masques were in that " age of reason and refinement " termed " monstrous and unnatural," [42] and that Chaucer was read,

[40] *Ibid.*, i. 133. [41] *Ibid.*, ii. 87. [42] *Ibid.*, ii. 267-268.

for the most part, only in translation. Warton alone had a wide and rich enough knowledge of literature and adequate historical perspective to recognize in Spenser's poem the treasure-trove of three great ages: the classical, the mediaeval, and the Renaissance. He did not crystallize this theory, but sections two, three, five, six, and ten point to his recognition. On the basis of his study of Spenser's borrowings from the literature of the two latter periods, *Observations on the Faerie Queene* is often judged "the best book ever written about Spenser." [43]

Quotations from various sources indicate that these miraculous books, the mediaeval romances, were not monstrous and unnatural in the age of Elizabeth, but so "highly fashionable" [44] that there was every reason to believe that Spenser knew and was indebted to them. The first book of the *Faerie Queene* is, in fact, "a regular and precise imitation of such a series of action" as is frequently found in books of chivalry.[45] The circumstances of each of Spenser's twelve knights "departing from one place, by a different way, to perform a different adventure, exactly resembles that of the seven knights entering upon their several expeditions, in the . . . *Seven Champions of Christendom*." [46] But the poet was more particularly indebted to three romances, the *Morte D'Arthur*, *Sir Bevis of Southampton*, and "an old ballad, or metrical romance," called *The Boy and the Mantle*, founded upon the French romance entitled *Le Court Mantel*. From the second, he drew "the miraculous manner" of the Redcross Knight's

[43] H. E. Cory, *The Critics of Edmund Spenser* (Berkeley, 1911), 164.

[44] *Observations*, i. 18. But Spenser himself says that the legends of chivalry were out of date in his day.

[45] *Ibid.*, i. 17.

[46] *Ibid.*, i. 18.

healing in the dragon-encounter in the first book; from the last, the conceit of Florimel's girdle; but from the *Morte D'Arthur*, he borrowed many of his names, copied the circumstances of Tristram's birth and education, took the hint of the Blatant Beast, the name of Malecasta's castle, his reference to the "holy grayle," and the story of the mantle of the beards of knights and locks of ladies.[47] To show how popular the Lady of the Lake was, Warton cites Laneham's famous *Letter "wherein part of the entertainment untoo the queens majesty at Killinworth-castl in Warwicksheer in this soomers progress*, 1575, *is signified*," with the happy thought that it is not improbable that Spenser alluded to some of the circumstances in these celebrated festivities.[48] That the poet was affected by just such entertainments as the one described in this letter is common knowledge now, but no one had as yet so fully caught the spirit of the *Faerie Queene* as Warton when he recognized the influence.[49] Hughes's suggestion that "the Remains of the old *Gothick* Chivalry were not quite abolish'd" when Spenser wrote was not more apt.[50]

Included in Warton's second essay are also a discussion of Spenser's faeries and a reference to his use of the chronicles. Hughes had objected to the plan of the

[47] Warton notes, however, that Drayton alludes to a mantle of beards in Geoffrey of Monmouth, to whom Warton unfortunately gives slight attention [i. 25, 26]. Cf. p. 94.

[48] *Observations*, i. 28.

[49] Warton discovered in Laneham's *Letter* the titles of two other romances to which, he thought, Spenser was somewhat indebted: *The Squire of Low Degree* and *Huon of Bordeaux*. In a note on Lord Berners's translation of *Huon of Bordeaux*, he mentions *Arthur of Little Britain* as also translated by Berners [ii. 183, 138]. Cf. Edwin Greenlaw, "Britomart at the House of Busirane," *SP*, XXVI. 124 n.

[50] See p. 41.

poem because "the scene was laid in *Fairy-Land*, and the chief actors were *Fairies*." [51] Warton was more seriously concerned with discovering their source, which he concludes to have been in romance and folklore of a Celtic and oriental origin, enriched by the poet's own inexhaustible imagination.[52] Apparently the first scholar to mention the chronicle material in the *Faerie Queene*,[53] he notices that Spenser "has introduced two historical genealogies of future kings and princes of England," besides "two or three other shorter sketches of English history," that in III. III. being "manifestly taken from the former part of John Hardyng's chronicle." [54] The poet's story of the "hideous Giants" in II. X. vii put him in mind of Geoffrey of Monmouth's account of the original state of Albion.[55] Offered in both editions of the *Observations*, these suggestions were probably an incentive to Upton's more thorough consideration of the chronicle influence.

With a method exactly like that with which he had discussed Spenser's debt to the romances, Warton turned to the subject of the poet's allegory, but, as remarked several times previously in this study, Hughes often pointed the direction that Warton followed, perhaps nowhere more fortunately, however, than in the present instance, for Hughes too had recognized that the allegory of the *Faerie Queene* was a product of the poet's age.[56] Warton, with a richer knowledge of native literature and a distinct penchant for source hunting, borrowed his theory and developed it more

[51] See p. 45.

[52] *Observations*, I. 55-65.

[53] C. A. Harper, *The Sources of the British Chronicle History in Spenser's Faerie Queene* (Philadelphia, 1910), 4.

[54] *Observations*, ii. 57-58, 242.

[55] *Ibid.*, ii. 149.

[56] See pp. 39-41.

thoroughly. Spenser no less than Homer copied the manners of his time. His " turn of thinking and manner of composing " were influenced by the magnificent " public shews and spectacles," the subject and foundation of which were allegorical.[57] He was in great measure tempted by Ariosto to write an allegorical poem, but his peculiar mode of allegorizing seemed dictated by such native performances as mediaeval moralities, allegorical masques, and dumb show, rather than by the fictions of Ariosto, whose purpose consisted not so much " in impersonating the virtues, vices, and affections of the mind," so ably represented by Spenser, as in the adumbration of moral doctrine under the actions of men and women.[58] Spenser's " fantastic portraits " in " so distinct and animated a style " reflected his familiarity with these emblematical personages in the spectacles of his age.[59] A further feature of Warton's interpretation is significant. " Can we call the FAIRY QUEEN," the critic asks, " upon the whole, a MORAL POEM? is it not equally an HISTORICAL or POLITICAL poem? " [60] The dual character of the allegory had been noticed upon several occasions, but no one had considered the historical aspect of importance equal to the moral.[61] Warton was orthodox, however, in his objections to the chief defects of the allegory—the use of symbolical illustration, under which no meaning is couched,[62] and the mingling of divine mystery and human allegory.[63]

[57] *Observations,* ii. 89.
[58] *Ibid.,* ii. 91.
[59] *Ibid.,* ii. 92.
[60] *Ibid.,* ii. 91 n.
[61] Cf. Hughes and Birch, pp. 45-46, 70.
[62] Such as the " twice sixteen warders clad in white " (Todd corrects to " all armed bright ") doing obeisance to Alma, teeth not usually being said to " rise up and bow to the mind " [ii. 95]
[63] Exercised throughout the whole first book in the interweaving of

He concludes his discussion with a brief retrospect of English poetry, in which he shows that the "visions and allegories" characteristic of an earlier poetry, having received their "ultimate consummation" in the *Faerie Queene*, had been supplanted by a new type "in which imagination gave way to correctness, sublimity of description to delicacy of sentiment, and majestic imagery to conceit and epigram." Whereupon he quotes Abbè du Bos to the effect that "it is impossible for a piece, whose subject is an allegorical action, to interest us very much"![64] Warton saw the magic in "Truth severe, by fairy Fiction drest," but having come to the end of his chapter, he thought that he needed to bolster his source study with a concluding criticism.[65]

Chaucer was the "well of English undefiled," and Ariosto was the poet whom Spenser aspired to "overgo"; consequently Spenser's indebtedness to both poets was altogether intentional. Warton was not the first to notice Spenser's "Chaucerisms," but he was the first to give detailed study not only to the poet's use of Chaucer's diction but to his dependence upon Chaucer's ideas. He hoped to show that Spenser drew his "largest draughts" from the earlier poet. He notes that although several classical poets left lists of trees, Spenser's catalogue in the wood of Errour seems more immediately from Chaucer's in the *Parlement of Foules*; that stanza ix is no obscure hint that Spenser had consulted the same poem for his description of

"imaginary instruments and expedients of romance" with "the mysteries" in Revelation, to Warton, "an impropriety, which, . . . amounts to an impiety" [ii. 98, 101].

[64] *Observations*, ii. 113.

[65] Cf. Cory, 167.

Nature in VII. VII. v-viii;[66] that the idea of Merlin's magic mirror and the story of the battle of the three brothers for Canacee came from the *Squire's Tale*;[67] that Blandamour's name was probably from *Sir Thopas*, and, finally, that the giant Ollyphant is likely the "same which Sir Thopas encounters in his expedition to the land of FAIRY."[68]

Ariosto's poetry was humorous, grotesque, and extravagant; hence the critic's more fervid commendation of Spenser's "beautiful and sublime representations."[69] Yet in praising the nobler temper of the *Faerie Queene*, Warton recognized in the *Orlando Furioso* a treasure-house of tales from which Spenser, less inventive and narratively gifted than Ariosto, drew numerous situations and stories. The earliest scholars had remarked the influence, and John Upton, in his *Letter concerning a new edition of the Faerie Queene* (1751) had pointed out many of the most obvious imitations.[70] But Warton gave the subject study. In Britomart he sees a copy of Bradamante and Marsifa.[71] The "great

[66] Spenser, however, had given "many new and delicate touches to Chaucer's rough sketch" [i. 160]. In stanza xlvi of the same canto, life is described as like Dan Cupid, "deckt all with floures"; in the *Romaunt of the Rose*, Chaucer represents Cupid as "yclad . . . all in floures and flourettes." In II. XII. li, Spenser again borrowed both words and thoughts from the *Parlement of Foules* [i. 147]. His descriptions of feasting (I. XII. xiv; V. III. iii) are also after the "indirect, but comprehensive manner" of Chaucer's portrayals of such events [i. 141-143].

[67] *Observations*, i. 148, 151.

[68] *Ibid.*, i. 189, 179. Words and phrases which Spenser adopted from Chaucer include "Mart," "darraine," "conteck," "glitterand," "endlong," etc., and "many a jane," "most and least," and whylom as antique stories tellen us," etc. [i. 162-195].

[69] *Ibid.*, i. 224-227.

[70] See p. 96.

[71] *Observations*, i. 210.

wide net" which Guile wore at his back is perhaps borrowed from the like expedient used by the giant Caligorante.[72] Spenser in Radegund with her city of females had an eye upon Ariosto's land of Amazons; and his "cursed cruell Sarazin," who "keepes a Bridges passage by strong hond," may be drawn from Ariosto's pagan who keeps a bridge which no man can pass over unless he fights him. The "distress of Pastorell" resembles that of Ariosto's Isobel, who was also seized by outlaws; in the second edition of the *Observations*, the author notes more happily that the pastoral part of the *Faerie Queene* was occasioned by Sidney's *Arcadia* in conformity to the common fashion of the time, which abounded in pastoral poetry.[73]

Warton's investigation of the native and romantic sources of the *Faerie Queene* was more illuminating because it was newer; he did not, however, neglect the classical influence. The result of his studies was that Spenser's "native force of invention would not suffer him to pursue the letter of prescribed fiction, with scrupulous observation and servile regularity."[74] Warton's attitude towards Spenser's use of classical mate-

[72] The incident of the Redcross Knight and Una's meeting with Archimago disguised as a hermit and the events that follow as a consequence of Archimago's magic and defeat seem to be copied from Angelica's meeting with a hypocritical hermit in the *Orlando Furioso*. The illusion of the fictitious Una effected by Archimago in I. II. is perhaps imitated from the deceptions in the enchanted castle of Atlanta. The difficulty which Arthur finds in killing Maleger very likely had its source in the encounter of Griffin and Aquilant with Orillo. Malbecco mixes with the goats and passes for one, as does Norandin in the *Orlando Furioso*. One of Ariosto's knights is named Sir Ferragh; Spenser may have found the name in Ireland, however, for he reports in his *View of Ireland* that many of the Irish are so named.

[73] *Observations*, i. 217.

[74] *Ibid.*, i. 66.

rials, his alterations in particular, is more liberal than the usual neo-classical opinion, which objected to variations from accepted traditions except when the variations were introduced for the purposes of a moral. His method is apparent in a note on the Garden of Proserpina, which Upton had identified in Claudian.[75] In *De raptu Proserpinae* Pluto describes to Proserpine a grove in Hades which is to be sacred to her. Like Upton, Warton thought that Spenser was indebted to this passage for his tree laden with golden apples. In the midst of Spenser's garden, however, was a silver seat. This was from Spenser's "own fancy" and "a *New Circumstance of* TEMPTATION"; likewise his "own allegorising invention" feigned that the plants in the garden were "direfull deadly blacke both leafe and bloom."[76] The giants depicted Cupid with particolored wings, but the splendid plumage given him in III. XI. xlvii was probably supplied by Spenser's imagination, or from the Italian poets.[77] A final observation is so characteristic that it could hardly be passed over. Warton wonders that Spenser, in alluding to Orthrus, forgot the seven-headed dragon stationed with Orthrus to guard the purple oxen of Geryon; "a dragon was too tempting a circumstance to be omitted"![78]

The influences upon the *Faerie Queene* were, however, not all literary and dramatic. Spenser's "pillours, fram'd after the Doricke guize" (IV. X. vi), were indebted to the fashionable improvements in building, which at that time were growing more into

[75] Cf. Upton and Rosemond Tuve, p. 91.

[76] *Observations,* i. 78-80. Warton observes, however, that Claudian's garden is filled with flowers more beautiful than those of Enna.

[77] *Ibid.*, i. 91.

[78] *Ibid.*, i. 102.

esteem; for, " although the roman, or grecian architecture, did not begin to prevail . . . till the time of Inigo Jones . . . some specimens of that style [were produced] much earlier." [79] The kitchen in the castle of Alma is such as was to be seen in " castles, and great houses." [80] Spenser's simile at IV. VI. xiv was perhaps suggested by the destruction of St. Paul's steeple by lightning in 1561.[81] And since tapestry was the most fashionable furniture of halls and state-rooms,[82] it was not surprising that Spenser referred to Nature's " footstoole " (VII. VII. x) as seeming richer

> then any tapestry,
> That Princes bowres adorne with painted imagery.

Warton's consistent use of the historical method, his spontaneous appreciation of Spenser's " wildly warbled song," his insistence upon native sources, not however to the neglect of foreign and classical, his interpretation of the poem in the light of literature popular in the poet's own day, were factors of the deepest significance in a newly developing knowledge and love of Spenser.[83] In spite of his youth and respect for current

[79] Warton mentions Somerset-house, in the Strand [ii. 184]. Cf. Upton, p. 80, and Frederick Hard's more recent study, " Princelie Pallaces," *Sewanee Review,* XLII. 293-310.

[80] *Ibid.*, ii. 96.

[81] " Like as the lightning . . .

> With dreadfull force falles on some steeple hie;
> Which battring, down it on the church doth glance,
> And teares it all with terrible mischance."

[82] *Observations*, ii. 230. Cf. Upton, pp. 98-99, and Frederick Hard's detailed study, " Spenser's 'Clothes of Arras and of Toure,' " *SP,* XXVII. 162-185.

[83] Warton was abused on the grounds of pedantry, inaccuracy, etc. in a scurrilous anonymous pamphlet entitled *The Observer Observ'd or Remarks on a curious tract, entitled " Observations on the Faery*

criteria, his was the truest and most comprehensive study in the age. Poet himself, he had been "nigh ravisht with rare thoughts delight," but he had also supplied "strength" to new readers and cheered the "dull sprights" of later commentators.

Queene of Spenser" (1756). Ascribed to William Huggins, this pamphlet deserved the harsh treatment it received at the hands of reviewers. Cf. Rinaker, 55; Carpenter, 270.

CHAPTER SIX

THE FIRST VARIORUM (1805)

CHAPTER SIX

THE FIRST VARIORUM (1805)

After 1758 the poetical works of Spenser rivaled the *Faerie Queene* in number of editions; three appeared in collections of the British poets between that date and the first years of the nineteenth century, notably in Bell's (1778-1788), Anderson's (1792), and Aikin's (1802). Twice within the period paraphrases of the *Faerie Queene* were attempted, in blank verse in 1774, and in prose five years later in a two-volume allegorical romance entitled *Prince Arthur.* Reprints of the *View of Ireland* (1763) and *Mother Hubberds Tale* (1784) appeared also, and in 1792 *Dispersed Poems* was printed in Waldron's *Literary Museum.*[1] Then in 1805, as a climax to the scholarship of the entire century and a complete codification of the Spenser-lore of the day, the first variorum edition of the *Works* was published.

The reprints of the prose treatise and *Mother Hubberds Tale* are insignificant, and the issues of the poems but slightly more important. Based upon Upton's *Faerie Queene* and Hughes's text of the minor poems, and printed in collections of the British poets, these issues of the poems are obviously illustrative of a popular interest rather than of any serious scholarship. Hughes's biography and remarks on the various poems and Upton's observations on the *Faerie Queene* are

[1] Including Spenser's verses in the Harvey-Spenser letters, in Nennio's *Treatise of Nobility,* in the *Historie of George Castriot* in Lewkenor's *Venice,* a couplet attributed to Spenser in a book belonging to the Earl of Cork, verses " by Spencer " in *Chorus Poetarum,* and a sonnet signed " E. S.," prefixed to Peacham's *Minerva Britanna.*

prefatory to Bell's edition; Anderson's has only a perfunctory life; Aikin's, however, contains criticism of some note and interest.

When the works of Dr. Johnson's poets were reedited in 1802, Spenser's poems were included [2] because his name had obtained "by long possession . . . a permanent rank among the major poets of the nation." In Aikin's words, it had become impossible for "the student of English . . . through regard to his reputation" to remain "unacquainted with the work of one who fills such a space in the history of his art." [3] For remarks on subjects that had become standards for Spenserian criticism in the eighteenth century—the plan and design of the *Faerie Queene*, Spenser's character as an allegorical painter, use of classical and Italian sources, stanza, versification, and language—Aikin is indebted to previous editors and commentators. Spenser, he says, "could not afford to be nice in selection," but "like all other composers of very long poems . . . was obliged to be contented with such matter as occurred, rather than with such as he would deliberately have approved." [4] Gifted with the richness of invention and warmth of feeling which presented the manner of his times in its happiest form, the poet lacked "that rare elevation of genius which places a man above the level" of his age.[5] Yet, in spite of defects, the *Faerie Queene* "will ever be considered . . . one of the capital productions of English poetry," though it will "probably not often be *read through*,"

[2] Johnson had omitted Spenser because he was unable to secure any new biographical materials concerning the poet [Boswell's *Johnson*, ed. Hill, iv. 410].

[3] *Poetical Works*, ed. Aikin, i. iii.

[4] *Ibid.*, i. xxxviii.

[5] *Ibid.*, i. xx.

nor have much study bestowed upon its plan or "the particular signification of all its mysteries and historical allusions." [6] Comments on the minor poems are more caustic. The *Shepheardes Calender* would have been "consigned to oblivion, had it not been borne up by the fame" of the *Faerie Queene*; *Daphnaida* is "an elegy of most unreasonable length on a person never heard of"; the *Teares of the Muses* consists of "eloquent complaints . . . somewhat too monotonous"; the *Ruines of Time* is "a fine idea, inadequately executed"; *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* and *Mother Hubberds Tale* "refer to characters and events in the court-history of the time, which it would be difficult now to elucidate, should any commentator think the task worth attempting." [7] Aikin lacked the spontaneous delight of his more immediate predecessors, as well as the warm admiration of earlier eighteenth-century scholars; his criticism serves as a barometer, however, for it, in part, indicates what is really true, that even some of the poet's devotees reread only his purple patches.

In January, 1803, the Reverend Mr. Meen wrote to Bishop Percy that "Mr. Todd, the ingenious editor of Milton" was "very busy in preparing a splendid and useful edition of all Spenser's Poems." [8] Described by the editor as the first "to which the illustrations of various authors have been subjoined," Todd's edition is a typical variorum production. The first of its eight volumes includes an engraving from the portrait of the poet at Dupplin Castle, a dedication to George III, a preface, the biography of the poet, a list of previous

[6] *Ibid.*, i. xliv.

[7] *Ibid.*, i. xxii, xlvi, xlvii, xlviii.

[8] John Nichols, *Illustrations of the Literature of the Eighteenth Century*, vii. 58.

editions, three other lists which catalogue alterations, criticisms, and "professed" imitations of Spenser, a group of commendatory verses indicative of the admiration in which the poet was held during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the *Shepheardes Calender*. The second volume contains Hughes's essay on allegorical poetry and remarks on the *Faerie Queene*; Spence's discussion in *Polymetis* (1747) of the defects of Spenser's allegory; the first, second, fourth, and tenth chapters from Thomas Warton's *Observations on the Faerie Queene*; the remarks of Upton on the action and history of the *Faerie Queene*, and the comments of Hurd on the plan and conduct of the poem, to all of which are affixed additional notes or remarks by the editor. Spenser's letter to Raleigh, the commendatory and dedicatory verses to the *Faerie Queene*, with annotations by Todd, and six cantos of the poem are also included in this volume. The third, fourth, fifth, and sixth volumes with a part of the seventh contain the other books of the *Faerie Queene*. The remainder of the seventh and all of the eighth are given over to the minor poems and *A View of Ireland*, the Harvey-Spenser correspondence being represented only in extracts in the account of the poet's life in the first volume. Among the acknowledged and better known minor poems in the eighth volume appear also the *Dolefull Lay of Clorinda*, attributed by the editor to the Countess of Pembroke,[9] "a collection" of poems "brought together by Spenser," consisting of the *Mourning Muse of Thestylis* and *A Pastorall Aeglogue*, both of which are ascribed to Lodowick Bryskett,[10] *An Elegie or Friends Passion*, ascribed to

[9] Todd, viii. 61.

[10] *Ibid.*, viii. 66, 76.

Matthew Royden,[11] the two anonymous epitaphs, as well as *Brittains Ida*, which Todd did not attribute to Spenser, and four sonnets from *Dispersed Poems*. The volume concludes with glossarial, accentual, and general indexes. The editor remarks Spenser's contributions to *A Theatre of Voluptuous Worldlings*, and in volume seven prints an account of this work together with Spenser's items.

Todd was fortunate in having at his disposal certain valuable sources of information not previously available. These included the Lambeth manuscripts, both manuscript and printed information in the collection of the Marquis of Stafford, valuable extracts relative to the family of Spenser in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, and manuscript material from Gonville and Caius, and Emmanuel Colleges, Cambridge. J. C. Walker "transmitted" information and notes from Dublin; Joseph Warton, the nephew of Thomas, lent his uncle's copy of the second folio of the *Works*; another friend furnished a text of Upton's *Faerie Queene* with the editor's manuscript notes; Isaac Reed, George Chalmers, and others allowed Todd the use of early editions and "several . . . curious works essential" to his plan; and John Brand secured valuable information as to the date of the poet's death. Todd's preface is, therefore, devoted to an expression of gratitude for this material, and, secondly, to brief discussions of his own and some of the preceding issues. He commends Upton and Church for their diligent collations and regard for the original orthography, which they "judiciously followed," with the exception of some slight variations, compared and adjusted by Todd

[11] *Ibid.*, viii. 82. Church had also ascribed the poem to Royden [iii. 93].

himself.[12] The minor poems, however, are said to have received less care, every edition subsequent to the original productions having been more or less distinguished by innovation, which often perplexed what was "originally perspicuous," and by error which had sometimes converted what was serious into ridicule.[13]

Todd's own text was based on "a careful collation of the various poems . . . published while the author lived," with "an attention to the mutual help in regard to correction, as well as to the choice of phraseology and orthography," which the editions contemporary with Spenser afford.[14] *A View of Ireland* is especially mentioned, as having been given according to the first edition but "occasionally" compared with readings of authority, owing to Todd's having had access to four manuscripts.[15] While his labors hardly attained to the standard he claims, Todd's text is obviously an improvement upon others, notably as regards the minor poems. Professor Ernest de Sélincourt, one of the most painstaking of the recent editors of these poems, commends his predecessor's work as a valuable and fully annotated edition. He shows that Todd printed the *Shepheardes Calender* from the third quarto, collating with the second and fifth, but with no reference to the first or fourth. The absence of a date from the title-page of the second perhaps misled him into thinking it the first.[16] He frequently refers to the first folio of the *Works*, but where this and the second folio differ as to the minor poems, Todd follows the lections of 1617.[17] Like Upton, he was confused by the binding up of a 1611-1612 or 13 *Faerie Queene* with copies of

[12] *Ibid.*, i. A_3.
[13] *Ibid.*, i. A_3 verso.
[14] *Ibid.*, i. A_3.
[15] *Ibid.*, i. cxxii.
[16] *Minor Poems*, ed. Oxford, 508.
[17] See p. 8.

the minor poems in the text of 1617. Todd, however, was the first editor after 1679 to print E. K.'s gloss and the "Arguments" to the *Calender*; he was also the first editor to annotate all the minor poems. Even a casual inspection of his text and notes reveals that he depended in the case of the *Faerie Queene* upon Upton's readings and, particularly, upon the more careful collations of Church. But, as he suggested in his preface, he does not always agree with the two mid-century editors. He imitates Church,[18] however, in printing "avising" at IV. II. xxii. 7, in preference to "aduizing" of Spenser's quartos, which he considers "an unperceived errour of the press." [19] Since the word is spelled in the first quarto now with, and now without the "d," [20] the alteration seems unnecessary if the exact spelling is to be retained. Todd notes the variant readings of Upton and Church at III. X. xxxi. 7, and records that he prefers that of the first quarto, but strangely enough prints "vertuous pay," for which he has no warrant. An unauthorized lection occurs again at I. XII. xxxiv. 3, where he printed "unprovided scath" instead of "improuided scath." But such readings are not usual in Todd's text. He remarked Hughes's modernizations with disapproval; he chose Hughes's lection at VI. V. xxiv. 7, however, because he thought that the poet intended "seem'd" as a monosyllable. He argues with considerable ardor for two readings long abandoned, "halfe like a man" (V. IV. xxxvi. 8) and "chaw" (I. IV. xxx. 4), the one as being perfectly in character and the second as a common spelling in the poet's day. Although his emen-

[18] Also the folios, Hughes, and the Tonson octavo (1758).
[19] Todd, v. 179.
[20] See I. V. xl; II. IX. xxxviii, lix; III. IX. xxiii, etc.

dations are less numerous than those of Upton and Church, several are worthy of mention, one in particular being highly probable. This is at V. X. iii. 6, where the poet's editions read "Armericke." Upton suggested that Spenser intended "Bretagne," called formerly "Aremorica or Armorica";[21] Jortin supposed "Armoric" correct;[22] and Church, not unobservant of "Armorick" at II. X. lxiv. 5, printed "Armoricke";[23] Todd notes that the word in this last passage, however, is a substantive accented on the first syllable, whereas "Armericke" is an adjective with stress on the second; hence he suggests that the poet wrote "Americke," but owing to an error of the press "Armericke" was printed. Such a reading would be a compliment to both the queen and Raleigh and would more strongly mark the opposition to the Moluccas.[24] Church noticed that the rhyme required another word than "chace" at II. II. vii. 7, but was unable to suggest one. Todd offered "ray" as proposed by the editor of Jonson's *Sad Shepherd* (1783). He also reports a completion for the hemistich in II. III. xxvi. 9, "most gorgeously set out," which he found written "in an old hand . . . probably coeval with that of the poet" in a copy of the first edition belonging to Thomas Park.[25] Todd's purpose was not so singularly textual as, for example, that of Church, but whether or not all of his readings are correct, he deliberated carefully as to which lection to print. His judgment was ordinarily sound, and his work, as a whole, is accurate.

[21] Upton, ii. 628.
[22] *Remarks on Spenser's Poems,* 121.
[23] Church, iv. 156.
[24] Todd, vi. 242.
[25] *Ibid.,* iii. 264; see Jonson's *Sad Shepherd,* ed. 1783, 29, 122-123; Todd, iii. 309.

His notes, apart from the attention given to variant readings and such problems as have been mentioned, consist of copious critical and explanatory extracts from the annotations of Jortin, Warton, Upton, and Church, and less frequent quotations from Hughes, Hurd, Walker,[26] Tyrwhitt,[27] Boyd,[28] Thyer,[29] and others, together with the personal criticisms and original comments of the editor. Todd reprints Digby's published commentary and Upton's summaries of the several books of the *Faerie Queene*. But little interested in the political allegory, he quotes or alludes to Upton's interpretations. He thinks the reader "better pleased" to see Sidney than Leicester imaged in Arthur, however, and in other instances disagrees with Upton.[30] He quotes from the notes of Upton and Church on Spenser's indebtedness to the chronicles, and draws extensively from their explanations as to matters of diction, pronunciation, and accent. Warton and Hurd furnish him with materials from the romances and contemporary literature; Jortin and Upton, with notes bearing on classical sources. Upton's work also supplied illustrations from Italian writers.

The original comments of the editor concern in general two subjects: the poet's diction and the influence of earlier or contemporary literature upon his poetry.[31] Todd throws no new light on the poet's diction, but follows the precedents set by Upton, Church, and Warton, with somewhat more thoroughness as to

[26] Relative chiefly to Irish affairs and Italian literature. See p. 143.
[27] Concerning matters of diction.
[28] On the interpretation of the text and parallels from Dante.
[29] Concerning Milton's imitations of Spenser.
[30] Todd, i. clxviii. Cf. p. 84.
[31] Characteristics also of Todd's *Milton* (1801). Cf. Ants Oras's criticism of this work [*Milton's Editors and Commentators*, 320-340].

corrections, sources, and accentuation. He defines not only obsolete terms, but such simple words as " aspire," and " port " (bearing), the latter cited by Warton earlier, but certainly common enough at the beginning of the nineteenth century, if not before. Indebted to previous scholars, he is quick, however, to catch their errors, more particularly those of Upton and Church, and such as occur in Dr. Johnson's *Dictionary*. He notes that " ponder " in the February eclogue (l. 151) of the *Calender* was corrupted in 1611 to " pond " and " very improperly " introduced into Johnson's *Dictionary* as a word used by Spenser.[32] Sources for the poet's language are, as usual, identified in Latin, French, and Italian, with considerable attention to Anglo-Saxon origins, but more especially are noted in moralities, romances, and other specimens of mediaeval literature. Todd is not any more original in the last regard than in his correction of errors in diction; [33] his work is, however, just as thorough in the one instance as in the other. He points out the use of numerous examples from the *Faerie Queene*, " under the various figures of Syntax," in Alexander Gill's *Logonomia Anglica* (1621), and quotes the commendation of the poet's language in *Angliae Speculum Morale* (1670) to the effect that Spenser's " noble " design was " to shew us that our language was expressive enough of our own sentiments," and " to upbraid those who have indenizon'd such numbers of forreign words." [34]

Todd's intimate acquaintance with less familiar literary productions enabled him to indicate sources other than dictional. He suggests that Spenser was indebted

[32] Todd, i. 40.

[33] Warton, in particular, had preceded him in such studies.

[34] Todd, ii. cxli.

in the tenth canto of the first book of the *Faerie Queene* to the old morality, *Everyman*, and quotes from Warton's *History of English Poetry* to show that the poet was probably somewhat indebted for his description of Despair to Skelton's *Magnificence*. He was not of Warton's opinion that Spenser was influenced by Higgins's Despayre in *The Mirror for Magistrates*, for he found it " not . . . easy to pronounce whether Spenser or Higgins . . . [were] the copyist," but thought that Marlowe plagiarized Spenser's celebrated simile of the almond tree in the first book.[35] Lengthy extracts from Bryskett's *Discourse of Civill-Life* illustrate the moral intent of the *Faerie Queene*, but in discussing the plan as revealed in the letter to Raleigh, Todd proposes that Spenser may have been influenced also by *Le Livre de droit d'Armes*, a work specifying the twelve virtues becoming a man of rank and courage, published in 1488 at Paris.[36] He thinks it not unlikely that the poet may even have taken " hints " from a Latin poem, *Septem Cyclopeidon Libri* (1555), and also from a French spiritual romance, *Le Voyage du Chevalier errant* (1557).[37] The poet was probably somewhat indebted for the Mask of Cupid to Barnabe Riche's *Travailes and Adventures of Don Simonides*, perhaps to *Tempio d'Amore* of Marchese dal Carretto,[38] and " in a small degree " to the " Amadis de Gaule and other publications." [39] The editor seems to have forgotten, however, that masques were quite common in Spenser's own day and that an enchanted chamber was in every fairy tale. He discovers Spenser's Envy and Gluttony in Alciat's *Emblems* and the original of the poet's " Archi-

[35] *Ibid.*, iii. 22.
[36] *Ibid.*, i. liv.
[37] *Ibid.*, ii. cxxiii-cxxiv.
[38] *Ibid.*, ii. civ.
[39] *Ibid.*, v. 105.

tect of cancred guile" in the "old Dragon . . . *fraudis artifex*" in Gregory Nazianzen's *Christus Patiens*.[40]

Critical ability, industry, enthusiasm, and humor are requisites for an editor of Spenser. Todd possessed the first three; his want of the last is apparent in his demanding realism of a poet whom he constantly admits indebted to the romances. When Satyrane, Paridell, and Britomart, the would-be guests of Malbecco (III. IX. xviii), call for "fire in earnest," Todd remarks the impossibility of their securing it "in so wet a night," the poet not having informed the reader of any other habitation in the neighborhood of Malbecco's castle.[41] His argument against Chalmers's view that Spenser had been married before his union with Elizabeth Boyle is just as amusing. Spenser, he thinks, must have been a bachelor because he wrote no love verses to any other lady "in the interval between the faithlessness of Rosalind and his introduction to Elizabeth"—to Todd proof enough.[42] But if he took some of the absurdities of the *Faerie Queene* a little too seriously, Todd had the warmest admiration for his poet, in fact, he subscribed "with gratitude" to Hurd's dictum that "*Faery* Spenser still ranks highest among the Poets," and was not at all of the latter's opinion that the *Faerie Queene* had fallen "into so general a neglect that all the zeal of its commentators" would never restore it to those honors it had "irrecoverably lost." This view he illustrates by quoting the tributes of poets and critics from the time of Spenser to his own day.[43] His marked in-

[40] *Ibid.*, vi. 317; iii. 220.

[41] *Ibid.*, v. 13.

[42] *Ibid.*, i. cxii. Cf. pp. 155-156 and Geo. Chalmers's *Supplemental Apology for the Believers in the Shakespeare-Papers* (London, 1799), 30.

[43] *Ibid.*, ii. clxxxiii, clxxix; i. clxxxvii-cxcvi.

terest in the mediaeval romances made him readily acknowledge the poet's "happy talents of invention and exhibition," as especially set forth in the more romantic fourth book in the "gallant deeds of Britomart, the contention for Florimel's Girdle, and the overthrow of Corflambo by Prince Arthur." [44] Todd's final emphasis is, however, not on the spontaneous delight to be derived from the poetry but on its instructive value. Spenser's poetry inculcates "those impressive lessons, by attending to which the gay and thoughtless may be timely induced to treat with scorn, and indignation, the allurements of intemperance and illicit pleasure"; yet subservient as Spenser's work is to the interests of private life, Todd finds it also "a vehicle of sound publick spirit." [45] The poet is praised personally for his "gentle disposition . . . friendly and grateful conduct, . . . humility," and "exquisite tenderness," but "above all for his piety and morality." [46]

The notes on the minor poems illustrate similar editorial industry and interests akin to those observed in the notes on the *Faerie Queene*. Attention is again given to variant readings, matters of diction, and the citation of comparable passages from curious and isolated literary productions. Todd prints an account of the *Booke of the Shepheardes Kalender* from which the title of Spenser's *Calender* was derived, and quotes from the opinions of Dryden, Pope, Hughes, and Aikin concerning Spenser's work, observing himself that the poet "most ably exhibited the delightful scenes of rural

[44] *Ibid.*, v. 480. He commends II. VI. xiii, as "a most elegant" stanza, in which poetry and romance are so happily united that the passage is "not easily" to be paralleled in other poets [*Ibid.*, iii. 392].

[45] *Ibid.*, i. clxvi-clxvii. [46] *Ibid.*, i. clxvi.

simplicity, although indeed with no new imagery." [47] He considers it absurd "to make shepherds deliver learned truths in rustick dialect," but admits that the modern pastoral derived much of its success "from an attention to Spenser's liveliness of description and to the innocence of his characters." He suggests that some have assigned the name of "Edward Kerke" to E. K., whereas others have supposed his name "King," or believed him to be the poet himself.[48] To show the popularity of the *Shepheardes Calender*, the editor again illustrated his ingenuity in discovering curious literary achievements by quoting from John Dove's manuscript translation in Latin verse. Dove alludes to the "unowned poem" as almost buried in oblivion, but Todd reminds his reader that it was used to the exigencies of the law in Abraham Fraunce's *Lawiers Logike* in 1588, certainly an unusual service for the *Calender*, but as evidence of popularity less striking because of the friendship between Philip Sidney and Fraunce.[49]

The other minor poems receive less attention. The "enigmatical wrong" hinted at in *Virgils Gnat* may have been Leicester's displeasure in consequence of Spenser's plea in behalf of Archbishop Grindal;[50] "the coxcomical Ape at Court" in *Mother Hubberds Tale* is, perhaps the person whom Harvey alludes to

[47] *Ibid.*, i. 209.

[48] *Ibid.*, i. xxi. Todd does not name the authors of these various conjectures as to E. K.'s identity. He says, "By the mention of Mystresse *Kerkes*, in the next paragraph [of Spenser's letter to Harvey, dated Oct. 5, 1579], some have been led to assign the name *Edward Kerke* to the old scholiast. Some also have not failed to suppose that *King* might be the name; and, that the force of guessing might no further go, to imagine even the poet and the commentator the same person!"

[49] *Ibid.*, i. xv-xvi.

[50] *Ibid.*, i. lxxx.

as " the mirrour of Tuscanism " in his reply to Spenser's letter of April 7, 1580, an interesting interpretation in the light of later research;[51] the date of the composition and historical identifications are the chief subjects considered in *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*; the *Fowre Hymnes*, " a warning to thoughtless lovers," are said to be indebted both to Boethius and Chaucer for " the Platonick and ' Faire Chaine of Love.' "[52] To the " remarkable mixture of the Christian and Platonick doctrines," especially characteristic of *An Hymne of Heavenly Beautie,* Todd, unlike his predecessors, offers no objection.[53] He was the first editor to note the similarity between sonnets thirty-five and eighty-three in the *Amoretti*; in cataloguing the lost poems, he indicates their titular likeness to productions popular in Elizabethan times;[54] lastly he regretted the loss of Spenser's prose treatise, *The English Poet*, and his own inability to secure a copy of *Axiochus*, though he doubted the poet's having translated the dialogue.[55]

Philip Neve announced in 1789 that a life of Spenser carefully drawn out from the most authentic memorials was the great desideratum of poetical history.[56] No such life appeared, however, till Todd published his " very humble account . . . from authentick records."[57] In spite of its " want of biographical elegance," this is the editor's most original contribution. It is significant both in the number of new facts accumulated and in the amount of old material authen-

[51] *Ibid.*, i. lxxxi. See *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory*, 104-132.
[52] *Ibid.*, viii. 242; i. cxiv.
[53] *Ibid.*, viii. 243.
[54] *Ibid.*, i. lxx.
[55] *Ibid.*, i. clxxii. Cf. p. 75.
[56] *Cursory Remarks on Some of the English Poets*, 17.
[57] Todd, i. A_4 verso.

ticated or disproved. Long extracts from the Harvey-Spenser correspondence, which interrupt the continuity, should perhaps have been omitted, and the letters given in full in some volume to which biographical reference might have been made. Bryskett's *Discourse of Civill-Life* should have been similarly treated. But whatever the life lacks in elegance or orderly scholarship, it is factually important.

On the authority of William Oldys's manuscript additions to Winstanley's *Lives of the English Poets*, the editor records that Spenser was born "in London in East Smithfield by the Tower." [58] Having been unable to secure further information about his early education, Todd notes that the poet cultivated "with successful attention . . . the useful as well as elegant in academical learning," as illustrated in "the abundance of classical allusions in his works" and in "the accustomed moral of his song." [59] He rejects the long discredited story of the fellowship, but infers from Harvey's letter of April 7, 1580, that some disappointment had occurred in regard to Spenser's academical views, perhaps some disagreement between him and his tutor.[60] Like Upton, he thinks it not unlikely that Spenser visited in the north of England, not "as a mere pensioner" on the bounty of relatives, but probably as a tutor to some young friend.[61] He was not of the opinion that the poet had served in Ireland as secretary to Sir Henry Sidney and doubted Spenser's ever having gone to France; yet, without evidence, he suggested that Spenser returned to England with Grey in

[58] *Ibid.*, i. i.
[59] *Ibid.*, i. i-ii; cf. ii. clxvi.
[60] *Ibid.*, i. iii.
[61] *Ibid.*, i. iv-v; cf. Upton, p. 101.

1582.[62] He scoffs at the reason-rime story as unsupported by requisite authority, and quotes the facts of Spenser's pension and laureateship as discovered by Malone.[63] The latter's researches furnished him knowledge of Spenser's appointment as sheriff of Cork, where Todd thought the poet's marriage occurred.[64] Not forgetting the adversities which drove Spenser into England, nor the frequently repeated anecdote of his returning the gift of the Earl of Essex, Todd doubted that the poet died in poverty. He suggests that his pension would have kept him from extreme want regardless of his Irish losses, that had he been so reduced, neither the crown nor his noble connections, the Spencers of Althorpe, would have totally neglected him, that the story of starvation hardly fits in with Camden's report of the funeral, and finally, that had Spenser been in dire circumstances, he would have retained the Earl's gift for the benefit of his family.[65] An "invaluable anecdote" which Todd discovered on the title-page of the second edition of the *Faerie Queene* originally owned by Henry Capell further supported this view, inasmuch as Capell omitted all mention of the poet's extreme need. From this note, Todd concluded that the testimony of Camden was correct, that Spenser died in King street, Westminster, and not as Cibber, Warton, and some others averred in King street, Dublin, and apparently, from Capell's phrase "apud diversorium" at an inn or lodging house, where he and his family had been since their arrival in England.[66] Todd had no information as to what became of the family immediately after Spenser's death, but cites

[62] *Ibid.*, i. xlviii. Cf. p. 25.
[63] *Ibid.*, i. lxvi-lxvii.
[64] *Ibid.*, i. cxxviii, cxi.
[65] *Ibid.*, i. cxxx-cxli.
[66] *Ibid.*, i. cxxix-cxxx.

from the Carew manuscripts the letter of the Lords of the Privy Council in England to Sir George Carew, " in behalf of Mrs. Spenser," with respect to her petition for the recovery of her husband's property in Ireland.[67] He reports the marital, religious, and political affiliations of Silvanus and Peregrine Spenser, corrects the error in the last folio (1679) that Hugolin was the great-grandson rather than grandson of the poet,[68] quotes the petition of William for the forfeited lands of Hugolin,[69] and records, on the authority of J. C. Walker, that " an Edmund Spenser of Mallow is yet remembered in Dublin," and that his daughter, a Mrs. Burne, was the last lineal descendant of the poet.[70] Todd made no purposeful study of Spenser's circle of friends, but from time to time noticed the poet's associates with brief biographical comments. He mentions " Maisters " Preston and Still, referred to in Spenser's correspondence with Harvey, John Chalkhill, called " an acquaintant and friend," and others better known, such as Sidney, Raleigh, the Spencers of Althorpe, and Leicester, the only friend without " unequivocal merit." A fair list of laudatory allusions indicates the renown in which the poet was held from the time of his death to the nineteenth century. Interestingly enough, Todd mentions the dedication of William Smith's *Chloris* to " the most excellent and learned Shepheard, Collin Cloute," notes John Wesley's recommendation of the *Faerie Queene* to Methodists who planned going through a course of academical training, and quotes the ranking of Spenser (one

[67] *Ibid.*, i. cxliii.

[68] See p. 28.

[69] Referred to before by Birch and others, but the record of which was discovered by Chalmers [Todd, i. cxlvii-cli].

[70] Todd, i. cli.

above Dante, Ariosto, and Pope, and two above Tasso) according to "the balance of poets" in Dodsley's *Museum*. Biographical details not hitherto discovered, and this further information relative to the poet's literary circle and his reputation, enhance the value of Todd's well-authenticated account. Four especial characteristics of the editor have left decided imprints both upon his biography and text. These are his moralistic attitude, his serious concern over matters of diction, his knowledge of the curious and less familiar productions of his own and other literatures, and his tendency to judge Spenser's work in its historical perspective. Such characteristics identify him as a transitional figure and make his edition a kind of bridge between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, though its bent is more Augustan than romantic. Todd's was the careful, painstaking labor of a student, not of an original thinker. He marked out no new paths in Spenserian research, but so thoroughly and so conscientiously followed those traced by Jortin, Upton, Church, and especially Warton, that his edition has become a landmark in the history of Spenserian scholarship.

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

As I have followed the ways of Spenserian scholars throughout two centuries I have not always been " nigh rauisht with rare thoughts delight," but have rather wished that I might more frequently have interrupted " my tedious trauell " with such sweet variety as may be discovered at all times in the poet's own delightful land of Faery. " Why worry," the incurious may say, " about Jortin's catalogue of classical parallels, nay, even Upton's more sparkling eighteenth-century comments? Warton, of course, is important, because Warton investigated sources, but if one must choose, it is much better to know the *Faerie Queene* than what Warton said about it." Thus have I argued even to myself from time to time; and now, at the end of several years of research, I find myself asking finally, what does it matter? Spenser, as Dr. Johnson said of Shakespeare, was

> read, admired, studied, and imitated, while he was yet deformed with all the improprieties which ignorance and neglect could accumulate upon him; while the reading was yet not rectified, nor his allusions understood.

Questions of this sort arise now and again in the minds of scholars. Pessimistic moments come when they are ready to exclaim what certainly some of my readers would acquiesce in at the present, " a lot of bother about nothing." What grave difference does it make whether an editor printed c-h-a-w or j-a-w? But perhaps, after all, the matter may be viewed somewhat more optimistically. The study does throw light on certain Spenserian problems, and however unimportant,

anything that adds to our knowledge of one of the four greatest English poets could hardly be totally inconsequential. It has a significance, however, other than this. A compendium of Spenserian research, it is in miniature a history of scholarship at large. The fumbling, but increasingly successful efforts of Hughes, Jortin, Birch, Church, Upton, and Todd towards greater accuracy of the text represent the slow process by which scholars came to have a regard for careful, painstaking workmanship. Warton's study of the poet's sources suggests the breaking down of an old canonical rigidity and narrow dogmatism that judged a work of art by standards of a later time rather than by such criteria as had originally inspired it. Gradually decreasing objection in the eighteenth century to Spenser's alteration of classical myths, more especially to his mixture of pagan and christian lore, points towards that more liberal conception which grants an artist perfect freedom, demanding only that he succeed at his task. Thus, slowly reaching out, weighing evidence pro and con, learning by error, and more and more carefully scrutinizing fact, Spenserian scholars were drifting towards something more vital than meaningless parallels and minute matters of diction. It was not, Dr. Johnson said at the sale of Thrale's brewery, "a parcel of boilers and vats" the owner was offering, but "the potentiality of growing rich beyond the dreams of avarice." Just so, it was not merely the question as to whether Spenser borrowed from Chaucer or Ariosto in a particular instance, but rather that Jortin, Upton, Warton, and Todd were painfully and laboriously struggling towards "the truth that sets men free." That, I think, is the deeper significance of this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aubrey, John. *Brief Lives,* ed. Clark. 2 vols., Oxford, 1898.

Babcock, R. W. *The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry, 1766-1799.* The University of North Carolina Press, 1931.

Bathurst, Theodore. *Calendarium Pastorale.* London, 1653.

Beaumont, Francis, and John Fletcher. *The Works,* ed. Theobald, Seward, and Sympson. 10 vols. [London], 1750.

Blackmore, Sir Richard. *Essays upon Several Subjects.* 2 vols., London, 1716.

Bligh, E. W. *Sir Kenelm Digby and His Venetia.* London, 1932.

Bosker, A. *Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson.* Groningen, The Hague, 1930.

Boswell, James. *Life of Samuel Johnson,* ed. G. B. Hill. 6 vols., Oxford, 1887.

Calendar of State Papers, relating to Scotland, 1589-1603, ed. M. J. Thorpe. London, 1858.

Camden, William. *Annales Rerum Anglicanarum et Hibernicarum regnante Elizabetha.* London, 1615.

——— *Britannia.* London, 5th ed., 1600.

——— *Reges, Reginae, Nobiles, et Alli in Ecclesia Collegiata B. Petri Westmonasterii Sepulti.* London, 1600.

——— *Remaines concerning Britain.* London, 1605.

Carpenter, F. I. *A Reference Guide to Edmund Spenser.* Chicago, 1923.

Chalmers, George. *Supplemental Apology for the Believers in the Shakespeare-Papers.* London, 1799.

Cory, H. E. *The Critics of Edmund Spenser.* University of California Press, 1911.

Cromwell, Oliver. *Letters and Speeches,* ed. Thomas Carlyle–S. C. Lomas. 3 vols., London, 1904.

The Daily Advertiser. London, 1758-59.

The Daily Courant. London, August 22, 1715.

Dennis, John. *The Grounds of Criticism in Poetry.* London, 1704.

Digby, Sir Kenelm. *Concerning Edmund Spencer.* British Museum Add. Ms. 41, 846.

——— *Observations on the 22. Stanza in the 9th. Canto of the 2d. Book of Spencers Faery Queene.* London, 1643, 1644.

Dryden, John. *Essays,* ed. Ker. 2 vols., Oxford, 1900.

——— *Works,* ed. Scott and Saintsbury. Edinburgh, 1882-1893.

Durham, W. H. *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century.* Yale University Press, 1915.

Emerson, O. F. "Spenser's Virgils Gnat," *JEGP,* XVII (1918), 94-118.

Fuller, Thomas. *Church History of Britain,* repr. London, 1842.
——— *Worthies of England,* repr. London, 1840.
Greenlaw, Edwin. "Britomart at the House of Busirane," *SP,* XXVI (1929), 117-130.
——— *The Province of Literary History.* Baltimore and London, 1931.
——— *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory.* Baltimore and London, 1932.
Greg, W. W. "An Elizabethan Printer and His Copy," *The Library,* 4th series, iv. (1924), 102-118.
Hard, Frederick. "Princelie Pallaces," *Sewanee Review,* XLII (1934), 293-310.
——— "Spenser's 'Clothes of Arras and of Toure,'" *SP,* XXVII (1930), 162-185.
Harper, Carrie A. *The Sources of the British Chronicle History in Spenser's Faerie Queene.* Philadelphia, 1910.
Havens, R. D. "Thomas Warton and the Eighteenth-Century Dilemma," *SP,* XXV (1928), 36-50.
Heffner, Ray. "The Printing of John Hughes' Edition of Spenser," *MLN,* L (1935), 151-153.
Hooker, E. N. "The Discussion of Taste, from 1750 to 1770, and the New Trends in Literary Criticism," *PMLA,* XLIX (1935), 577-592.
[Huggins, William (?)]. *The Observer Observ'd or Remarks on a curious tract, entitled "Observations on the Faery Queene of Spenser."* London, 1756.
Hurd, Richard. *Letters on Chivalry and Romance,* ed. Edith J. Morley. London, 1911.
Husssey, Christopher. *The Picturesque.* London, 1927.
Impartial Estimate of the Rev. Upton's Notes on the Fairy Queen, An. London, 1759.
Johnson, Francis R. *A Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser Printed before 1700.* Baltimore, 1933.
Johnson, Samuel. *Lives of the English Poets,* ed. G. B. Hill. 3 vols., Oxford, 1905.
Johnston, Robert. *Historia Rerum Britannicarum.* Amsterdam, 1655.
Jonson, Ben. *The Sad Shepherd,* ed. 1783. London.
Jortin, John. *Remarks on Spenser's Poems.* London, 1734.
——— *Tracts, Philological, Critical, and Miscellaneous.* 2 vols., London, 1790.
London Evening-Post, Dec. 6-8, 1750.
Lotspeich, H. G. *Classical Mythology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser.* Princeton University Press, 1932.
McKerrow, R. B. *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers . . . 1557-1640.* London, 1910.

McKerrow, R. B. *The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text by his Earlier Editors, 1709-1768.* London [1933].

Milton, John. *Paradise Regained,* ed. Thomas Newton. London, 1752.

[Neve, Philip]. *Cursory Remarks on some of the Ancient English Poets.* London, 1789.

Nichols, John. *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century.* 8 vols., London, 1817-1858.

Oras, Ants. *Milton's Editors and Commentators from Patrick Hume to Henry John Todd (1695-1801).* Estonia: University of Tartu (Dorpat); London: Oxford University Press, 1931.

Pancoast, H. S. "Some Paraphrases of Milton," *Andover Review* (Boston), XV (1891), 35-54.

Percy, Thomas. *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript,* ed. J. W. Hales and F. J. Furnivall, 3 vols., 1867-1868.

Phillips, Edward. *Theatrum Poetarum Anglicanorum.* London, 1675. Repr. Canterbury, 1800.

Reed, Isaac. *The Plays of William Shakspear.* 21 vols., London, 1803.

Richardson, Samuel. *Correspondence,* ed. A. L. Barbauld. 6 vols., London, 1804.

Rinaker, Clarissa. *Thomas Warton; a Biographical and Critical Study.* University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Urbana, 1916.

Smith, D. N. *Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare.* Glasgow, 1903.

——— *Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century.* Oxford, 1928.

Spencer Redivivus, containing the First Book of the Fairy Queen, his essential Design preserv'd, but his obsolete Language and manner of Verse totally laid aside. Deliver'd in Heroick Numbers. London, 1687.

Spenser, Edmund. *A View of the State of Ireland.* In Sir James Ware, ed., *The Historie of Ireland, collected by Three Learned Authors.* Dublin, 1633.

——— *The Axiochus of Plato*; transl. by Edmund Spenser; ed. by F. M. Padelford. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1934.

——— *Dispersed Poems . . . now first collected.* In Waldron's *Literary Museum.* London, 1792.

——— *The Faerie Queene. Disposed into twelue books . . .* London, 1590.

——— *The Faerie Queene. Disposed into twelue bookes, Fashioning XII. Morall vertues.* With *The Second Part of the Faerie Queene. Containing the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Bookes.* 2 vols., London, 1596.

——— *The Faerie Queene. . . . Printed by H. L. for Mathew Lownes.* London, 1609.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queen: The Shepheards Calendar: Together with the other Works of Englands Arch-Poët, Edm. Spenser.* [London], 1611.

——— *The Faerie Queen: The Shepheards Calendar: Together with the other Works of England's Arch-Poët, Edm. Spenser.* [London], 1617.

——— *The Faerie Queene, with an exact Collation of the two original Editions . . . to which are now added a new Life of the Author* [by Dr. T. Birch]. . . . 3 vols., London, 1751.

——— *The Faerie Queene,* ed. Ralph Church. 4 vols., London, 1758.

——— *The Faerie Queene,* ed. J. C. Smith. 2 vols., Oxford, 1909.

——— *The Faerie Queene. A New Edition with a Glossary, and Notes explanatory and critical,* ed. John Upton. 2 vols., London, 1758.

——— *The Fairy Queen. With a Glossary.* 2 vols., London (Tonson), 1758.

——— *Minor Poems,* ed. Ernest de Sélincourt. Oxford, 1909.

——— *Poetical Works.* In Bell's *Poets of Great Britain.* Vols. XV-XXII. London and Edinburgh, 1778-1788.

——— *Poetical Works.* In Anderson's *Poets of Great Britain.* Vol. II. London, 1792.

——— *Poetical Works,* ed. J. Aikin. 6 vols., London, 1802.

——— *Poetical Works,* ed. F. J. Child. 5 vols., Boston, 1855.

——— *The Works of that Famous English Poet, Mr. Edmond Spenser.* London, 1679.

——— *Works,* ed. John Hughes. 6 vols., London, 1715.

——— *Works.* 6 vols., London, 1750.

——— *Works with the Principal Illustrations of Various Commentators,* ed. H. J. Todd. 8 vols., London, 1805.

——— *Works . . . A Variorum Edition,* ed. Edwin Greenlaw, C. G. Osgood, F. M. Padelford. Baltimore, 1932, etc.

Spingarn, J. E. *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century.* 3 vols., Oxford, 1908-1909.

——— *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance.* Columbia University Press, repr., 1930.

Spurgeon, C. F. E. *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion.* Cambridge, 1925.

Stark, Adam. *History and Antiquities of Gainsborough,* 2nd. ed., 1843.

State Papers. See Calendar.

Tuve, Rosemond. "Spenser and the Zodiake of Life," *JEGP,* XXXIV, 1-19.

Upton, John. *A Letter concerning a new edition of Spenser's Faerie Queene.* London, 1751.

Upton, John. *Critical Observations on Shakespeare.* London, 1st. ed. 1746, 2nd. ed. 1748.

——— See *The Faerie Queene.*

Waller, Edmund. *Works.* London, 1729.

Walpole, Horace. *Anecdotes of Painting in England,* ed. 1782.

——— *The Letters of Horace Walpole,* ed. Mrs. Paget Toynbee. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 16 vols., 1903-1905. Supplement, 2 vols., 1928.

Ware, Sir James. *De Scriptoribus Hiberniae.* Dublin, 1639.

Warton, Joseph. *An Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope.* 2nd. ed., London, 1762.

Warton, Thomas. *Observations on the Faerie Queene.* London, 1st. ed., 1754; 2nd. ed., 2 vols., 1762.

Whitehall Evening-Post. July 27-30, 1751; Dec. 6-8, 1760.

Winstanley, William. *Lives of the Most Famous English Poets.* London, 1687.

Worthington, John. *The Diary and Correspondence,* ed. James Crossley. 2 vols. in 3, Chetham Society, 1847-1886 [Manchester].

INDEX

INDEX

Addison, Joseph, 33 n., 39 n., 40 n., 41 n.
Aesop, 39 n.
Aikin, 139, 140-141, 151.
Alciat, 149.
Alençon, Duke of, 85-86.
Allegory: Hughes, 39, 40, 42-44, 70, 83, 96, 102, 116, 130, 131, 140, 142. Historical and political, 39, 46, 70, 75, 83-88, 95, 98, 112, 117, 141, *see also* persons. Moral, 39, 42, 44, 75, 83, 88-89, 96.
Alliteration, 75, 100-101.
Alva, Duke of, 85.
Amadis de Gaule, 149.
Amoretti, 5, 50, 102, 111, 153.
Anderson, 139, 140.
Andrews, Bishop, 24; *see also* Spenser, Edmund, life, at Cambridge.
Antiquarian interest, 116, 126; *see also* Warton; Percy; Hurd.
Apollodorus, 56.
Apollonius, 56.
Archaic language, *see* Language.
Architecture, 45; Gothic, 80, 115, 126, 134-135.
Ariosto, 38 n., 43, 44, 46, 75, 90, 96, 116, 117, 121, 122, 126, 130, 132, 133, 160.
Aristotle, 38 n., 91, 116.
Armada, 85.
Arthur of Little Britain, 128 n.
Arthur, Prince, 44, 45, 81-83, 84, 87, 96, 97, 117-119, 151.
Astrophel, 5.
Aubrey, 1, 24-25, 29, 116 n.
Ausonius, 56.
Author's point of view, need of understanding, 51; *see also* Historical Method.
Aylmer, Bishop, 69.
Axiochus, 75, 153.

Babcock, R. W., 121 n.
Ball, John, 55, 68.
Bathurst, Theodore, *Calendarium Pastorale*, 1, 9-10.
Beaumont, Francis, 62, 63.
"Beauties," 42, 43, 76, 110.
Bede, 95.
Beeston, William, 24.
Bell, John, 139, 140.
Bentley, Richard, 34 n.
Berni, 97.
Biblical allusion, 79, 80, 92, 108, 130.
Biography of Spenser, *see* Spenser, Edmund, life.
Birch, Thomas, 3, 59, 60, 63-70, 74, 83, 105, 106, 112, 124, 160.
Blackmore, Richard, 38 n., 81 n.
Blair, Hugh, 124 n.
Bligh, E. W., 15 n.
Blount, Thomas, 109.
Boccaccio, 92, 97.
Boethius, 153.
Borlase, Edmund, 109.
Bosker, A., 76 n., 124 n., 125 n.
Bosworth, William, 17.
Bowes, Robert, 83.
Boy and the Mantle, The, 127.
Boyd, 147.
Boyle, Elizabeth, 150; *see also* Spenser, Edmund, life, marriage.
Boyle, Robert, 22 n.
Brand, John, 143.

Brindley, J., 64.
Brittains Ida, see Fletcher, Phineas.
Bryskett, Lodowick, 68, 70, 142, 149, 154.
Buchanan, George, 95.
Burleigh, Lord Cecil, 23, 26, 50, 69, 83, 85, 111.
Bysshe, Edward, 12 n.

Camden, William, 1, 9 n., 17-19, 23, 49, 50, 68, 70, 84 n., 87, 95, 111, 155.
Campion, Thomas, 8.
Capell, Henry, 155.
Carew, George, manuscripts, 156.
Carew, Richard, *A Survey of Cornwall,* 95.
Carew, Lady Elizabeth, 6.
Carpenter, F. I., 8, 136 n.
Carretto, Marchesse dal, 149.
Catullus, 56, 91.
Chalmers, George, 143, 150.
Charles IX of France, 85.
Chaucer, Geoffrey, 14 n., 19, 22 n., 28, 29, 42, 47 n., 75, 93, 108, 116, 126, 131-132, 153, 160; Chaucerisms, 22, 30, 131.
Child, Francis J., 102.
Chivalric influence, 38, 41, 127-128.
Chronicles, 94-95, 109, 129; *see also* author or title.
Church, Ralph, 3, 6, 7, 59, 61, 67 n., 73, 79, 102-111, 143, 145, 146, 147, 157, 160.
Cicero, 56.
Classical influence, 41, 55-58, 90-92, 116, 126, 133-134, 135, 159; *see also* authors.
Claudian, 56, 91, 134.
Clio, 109.
Colin Clouts Come Home Againe, 5, 48, 50, 112, 141.
Collation: Hughes, 35; Jortin, 58; Birch, 64-67; Upton, 75-78; Church, 106; Todd, 141, 144.
Commendatory verses, *see* Dedicatory sonnets.
Complaints, 5, 112; *see also* separate titles.
Congreve, 51.
Cory, H. E., 127 n., 131 n.
Court Mantel, Le, 127.
Court of Love, The, 93.

Daily Advertiser, The, 73.
Daily Courant, The, 35 n.
Dante, 97.
Daphnaida, 5, 49, 141.
Davenant, preface to *Gondibert,* 10, 24 n.
Dedicatory sonnets and commendatory verses, 6, 8 n., 64, 103, 142.
Denham, John, 24 n.
Dennis, John, 40 n., 41 n., 123 n.
Diction, *see* Language.
Digby, Kenelm, 1, 14-17, 76, 147.
Dillingham, William, 9-10.
Dissertation concerning the Poems of Ossian, 124 n.
Dodd, Dr., 59.
Dodsley, 157.
Dove, John, MS. transl. of the *Shepheardes Calender,* 11, 152.
Drayton, Michael, 22 n., 94 n., 112.
Dryden, John, 11 n., 12 n., 14 n., 24, 38 n., 40 n., 44 n., 46 n., 69, 70, 82, 118, 151.
Duncombe, John, 74 n.
Duncombe, William, 62.
Durham, W. H., 42 n., 44 n.

Edwards, Thomas, 37 n., 60, 64, 66 n.
E. K., 10, 68, 145, 152.

Elegie, or Friends Passion, etc., *An,* 5, 33, 142.
Elizabeth, Queen, 46, 84, 86, 87, 101, 109.
Emendation: Hughes on, 35; Bentley on, 34 n., 58, 64, 77, 79, 105-107, 124, 145-146, 159, etc.
Emerson, O. F., 57 n.
English Poet, The, 21, 153.
Epic, *The Faerie Queene* as an, 38, 40, 80-83, 89, 118-119, 122-124.
Epitaph upon the Right Honourable Sir Philip Sidney, Knight, etc., *An,* 33, 49.
Epithalamion, 5, 49, 50, 102, 111.
Essex, Earl of, 28, 29, 69, 84, 155.
Everyman, 149.

Faden, William, 73.
Faerie Queene, The: Allegory in, *see* Allegory. Editions, first quarto, 3, 4, 33, 35, 65, 68, 77, 103, 104, 145; second quarto, 3, 4, 64, 65, 66 n., 77, 104; first folio, 2, 4, 8, 33, 64, 65, 77, 104 (for later editions, *see* names of editors); *see also* Spenser, Edmund, works. Evaluation of, *see* Spenser, Edmund, evaluation of. Lost books, 19, 23, 29, 69, 110; *see also* Manuscripts, lost. Plan of, 43-45, 80-83, 116-120, 121-123, 140.
Faeries, *see* Allegory.
Fairfax, Edward, 48.
"Faults Escaped," 1-2, 37, 65, 67, 68, 124.
Fenton, Elijah, 55, 70, 101, 112.
Fingal, 124 n.
Flaccus, 56.
Fletcher, *see* Beaumont.
Fletcher, Phineas, *Brittains Ida,* 11, 34, 59, 143.
Fowre Hymnes, 49, 112, 153.
Fraunce, Abraham, 152.
Friends Passion, see Elegie.
Fuller, Thomas, 1, 12, 20, 22-23, 26, 68, 69.

Gay, John, 48 n.
General Advertiser, 60 n.
Geoffrey of Monmouth, 94, 95, 109, 128 n., 129.
Gesner, 98.
Gildas, 95.
Gildon, Charles, 13 n.
Gill, Alexander, 148.
Glossaries, 10, 12, 34, 37, 55, 64, 74, 76, 78, 103, 143; *see also* Language.
Googe, Barnabe, 91 n.
Gordon, 95.
Gothic, 41, 45, 80, 110, 119-120, 128; *see also* Mediaeval.
Gower, 93.
Greek, 120 n; *see also* Classical.
Greenlaw, Edwin, 86 n., 95, 124 n., 128 n., 153 n.
Greville, Fulke, 85.
Grey, Lord, of Wilton, 20, 29, 84, 111, 154.
Grindal, Archbishop, 69, 152.
Guise, Duke of, 85.

Hacket, John, 10.
Hanmer, Meredith, 8.
Hard, Frederick, 135 n.
Hardyng, John, 109, 129.
Harper, C. A., 129 n.
Hartlib, Samuel, 20-22, 68.
Harvey, Gabriel, 2, 6, 104, 111; *see also* Spenser-Harvey correspondence.
Havens, R. D., 120 n., 121 n., 122 n.

Heffner, Ray, 33 n.
Herodotus, 56.
Hesiod, 56, 83, 97.
Higgins, 149.
Historical allegory, *see* Allegory, historical.
Historical method of criticism, 38, 51, 135, 157, 160; *see also* Learning.
Holinshed, 84, 95.
Homer, 40, 41, 45, 81, 82, 90, 100, 101, 116, 117, 130.
Hooker, E. N., 119 n.
Hopkins, John, 13 n.
Horace, 38 n., 56, 91.
Howard, Lord High Admiral, 86.
Huggins, William, 135-136 n.
Hughes, John, 33-51, 58-63, 68, 70, 74, 76, 82, 105, 111, 116, 118 n., 126, 128, 129, 139, 142, 147, 151, 160.
Huon of Bordeaux, 128 n.
Hurd, Richard, 119-120, 124 n., 142, 147, 150.
Hussey, Christopher, 99 n.
Hymnes, *see Fowre Hymnes.*

Imagery, 46-47, 99, 131.
Imagination, 29, 43, 44, 99-100, 117, 122; *see also* Invention.
Imitations and borrowing, *see* authors; Classical influence; Italian influence.
Impartial Estimate, An, 94 n.
Inaccuracy: of Spenser, 1-2, 98, 116, 124-125; of printers, 78.
Invention, 42, 44, 140, 151; *see also* Imagination.
Italian influence, 41, 43, 96-97, 140; *see* authors.

Johnson, Samuel, 36, 51, 76 n., 115 n., 140, 148, 159, 160.
Johnston, Robert, 1, 17, 19.
Jones, Dr. (vice-chancellor of Trinity College, Dublin), 22 n.
Jonson, Ben, 17, 111, 125-126; *Sad Shepherd,* 59, 146.
Jortin, John, 15, 47, 55-59, 65, 108, 110, 126, 146, 147, 159, 160.
Junius, 109.
Juvenal, 56.

Kent, William, 60, 63.
Kerke, Edward, 152.

Lambeth manuscripts, 143.
Laneham, 128.
Language, 6, 9, 12-14; Digby on, 16, 17, 26, 37, 78-80, 94, 101, 108, 116, 125-126, 140, 148, 157; *see also* Glossaries.
Lathum, George, 7.
Latin, *see* Classical influence.
Lay of Clorinda, The, 142.
Learning, Spenser's: Digby on, 15; editor must be acquainted with, 76, 135; *see also* Historical method.
Leicester, Earl of, 69, 84, 87, 101, 147, 152, 156.
Letter of the Authors to Sir Walter Raleigh, A, 6, 64, 74, 76, 83, 103, 119, 142.
Life, *see* Spenser, Edmund, life.
Livre de droit d'Armes, Le, 149.
London Evening-Post, 60.
London, William, 73.
Longinus, 109.
Lotspeich, H. G., 92 n.
Lownes, Humphrey, 7.
Lownes, Matthew, 2, 7 n.
Lucan, 15, 56.
Lucretius, 56, 91.

McKerrow, R. B., 125 n.
Macpherson, 124 n.

Malone, 116, 155.
Malory, Thomas, 94, 95, 128.
Manningham, John, 22 n.
Manuscripts, lost, 2, 5, 20-22, 23, 110; listed, 28-29, 153; *see also Faerie Queene*, lost books.
Marleburrough, Henry, 8.
Martial, 56.
Mary, Queen of Scots, 46, 86, 87.
May, Thomas, 15.
Mediaeval, 127; *see also* Gothic; Romance; Chivalric.
Meen, Rev., 141.
Melvil, 84 n.
Milton, 13, 25, 39 n., 48 n., 63, 76 n., 95, 96, 101, 109.
Minor poems, 141-144, 151; *see also* titles.
Mirror for Magistrates, 70, 93, 95.
Moral allegory, *see* Allegory, moral.
More, Henry, 22.
Moryson, Fines, 68.
Mother Hubberds Tale, see Prosopopoia.
Mourning Muse of Thestylis, The, 5, 142.
Muiopotmos; or the Fate of the Butterflie, 6; *see also Complaints.*
Mutabilitie cantos, 2, 105, 110; *see also Faerie Queene.*
Mythology, 116, 126; *see also* classical authors; Allegory.

Natalis Comes, 56, 58, 91.
Nazianzen, Gregory, 150.
Neve, Philip, 153.
New Canto of Spencers Fairy Queen, 74.
Newton, Thos., 39 n., 62, 76 n.
Nichols, John, 141 n.

Observer Observ'd, The, 135 n.
O'Flaherty, 68.
Olaus Magnus, 98.
Oldys, William, 68, 112, 154.
Oneill, Shane, 87.
Oras, Ants, 34 n., 40 n., 41 n., 76 n., 97 n., 125 n., 147 n.
Orthography, 2, 6, 34, 78, 93, 104, 105, 106, 144, 145, 159.
Ovid, 42, 56, 75, 90, 91, 99.

Padelford, F. M., 75 n.
Pancoast, H. S., 13 n.
Paradise Lost, 40 n., 41 n.; *see also* Milton.
Paradise Regained, 60 n., 62 n.; *see also* Milton.
Park, Thomas, 146.
Parr, Dr., 59.
Pastoral poetry, 48, 152; *see also Shepheardes Calender.*
Pastorall Aeglogue upon the Death of Sir Phillip Sidney, Knight, Etc., A, 5, 33, 142.
Percy, Bishop, 34 n.
Perrot, John, 87.
Philip, King, of Spain, 85.
Phillips, Ambrose, 48 n.
Phillips, Edward, 25-26, 30.
Pictorial quality of Spenser's verse, 29, 109.
Piers Plowman, 93.
Pindar, 56.
Plato, 56, 91.
Plutarch, 56, 91.
Pope, Alexander, 33 n., 48 n., 81 n., 151.
Prince Arthur, 139.
Prior, Matthew, 33 n.
Prose, *see View of the State of Ireland*; Spenser-Harvey correspondence; *Axiochus* (?).
Prosopopoia: or Mother Hubberds Tale, 1, 5, 7, 11 n., 26, 27, 28, 42, 49, 50, 96, 139, 141, 152; *see also Complaints.*

Prothalamion, 5.
Punctuation, 3, 104, 108.

Raleigh, Sir Walter, 24, 86, 115 n., 146, 156; *see also Letter.*
Ranelagh, Viscountess, 22 n.
Ray, 109.
Reed, Isaac, 34 n., 143.
Reliance upon last edition, 12.
Rhyme, 79, 100-101.
Richardson, J., 41 n.
Richardson, Samuel, 74 n.
Riche, Barnabe, 149.
Rinaker, C., 123 n., 136 n.
Ritson, J., 13, 34 n.
Robert of Brunne, 109.
Robert of Gloucester, 109.
Romances, metrical, mediaeval, 94, 116, 123, 127-128, 149, 151; *see also* authors and titles.
Rosalind, *see* Spenser, Edmund, life.
Ross, Johnannes, 95.
Rowe, Nicholas, 34 n.
Roydon, Matthew, 143.
Ruines of Rome: by Bellay, The, 27; *see also Complaints.*
Ruines of Time, The, 17, 50, 141; *see also Complaints.*
Rymer, 70.

Sackville, Thomas, 70.
Sammes, 109.
Selden, John, 9 n., 109.
Sélincourt, Ernest de, 144.
Seneca, 56, 91.
Septem Cyclopeidon Libri, 149.
Seven Champions of Christendom, The, 127.
Shakespeare, William, 12 n., 13, 100.
Shane, Capt., 22 n.
Shepheardes Calender, The, 1, 5, 6, 8, 9-11, 29, 34, 36, 37, 42, 48, 49, 50, 68, 69, 102, 111, 141, 142, 144, 145, 151, 152.
Sidney, Sir Henry, 25, 154.
Sidney, Sir Philip, 25-26, 27-28, 30, 33, 50, 69, 84, 85, 91, 93, 101, 111, 133, 147.
Sidonius, 56.
Sir Bevis of Southampton, 127.
Skelton, John, 149.
Smith, D. N., 12 n., 51 n.
Smith, J. C., 3, 37 n., 58, 106-107.
Smith, William, *Chloris,* 156.
Sonnets, 49; *see also Amoretti*; Dedicatory sonnets.
Sources, *see* authors.
Spelling, *see* Orthography.
Spence, 142.
Spencer Redivivus, 1, 13.
Spencers of Althorpe, 155; Sir John, 111.
Spenser, Edmund, life: Biographies, 17; Aiken, 140; Anderson, 140; Aubrey, 24-25; Bell, 140; Birch, 68-70; Camden, 17-19; Church ed., 103, 110-112; Fuller, 20, 22-23; Hughes, 34, 49-51, 139; Johnston, 19; Phillips, 25-26; 1679, 27-29; Todd, 141, 153 ff.; Upton, 101-102; Ware, 19-20; Winstanley, 26-27; summary of 17th century biographies, 29-30; *see also* names of associates. Lineage, 20, 111. Date of birth, 27, 49, 55, 68, 111. At Cambridge (fellowship, etc.), 18, 20, 24, 27, 30, 49, 55, 68, 101-102, 111, 154. Visit in North, 27, 50, 68, 101, 154. Rosalind, 24, 29, 102, 111. Trip to France, 50, 69, 101, 111, 154. To Ireland, 20, 29, 50. Reason-rime anecdote,

23, 29, 50, 69, 102, 155. Kilcolman, grant of, 20, 28, 29; destruction of, 18-19, 29, 110. Marriage, 102, 155; *see also* Boyle, Elizabeth. Return to England, 1598, 19, 20, 28, 29. Death, burial, poverty, 2, 18-19, 20, 22 n., 23, 26, 28, 29, 50, 69-70, 111, 155. Descendants, 28, 50-51, 70, 111, 155-156.
Spenser, Edmund, estimate of as a poet, 14; Camden, 18; Digby, 15-17; Hughes, 42-43; Phillips, 25; Ware, 20; 29, 30, 62, 70, 110, 140-141, 156-157.
Spenser, Edmund, works. Early editions: First folio (1611-1612 or 13), 1, 5 ff., 12, 33, 35-36, 77, 104, 144. Second folio (1617), 1, 7-8, 10, 36, 77, 124, 145. Third folio (1679), 1, 8, 11-13, 17, 27, 35, 74, 77, 145 (for later editions, *see* the names of editors). *See also* titles.
Spenser-Harvey correspondence, 12, 68, 139 n., 142, 154.
Spenser, Hugolin, 28, 50, 156.
Spenser, William, 50, 156.
Spenserian stanza, 26, 47, 70, 100-101, 116, 125, 140.
Spingarn, 122 n.
Spurgeon, C. F. E., 11 n., 12 n.
Squire of Low Degree, The, 128 n.
Stark, Adam, 62 n.
Statius, 56, 91.
Steele, Richard, 40 n.
Stone, Nicholas, 55.
Stowe, 95.
Stradling, Edward, 14.
Stradling, John, 19.
Surrey, Earl of, 93.
Sympson, John, 60, 62, 74.

Tapestry, 98-99, 126, 135.
Tasso, 40 n., 42, 43, 75, 97, 108, 117, 122 n.
Teares of the Muses, The, 5, 28, 50, 141; *see also Complaints.*
Temple, Sir William, 70.
Theatre of Voluptuous Worldlings, A, 143.
Theobald, Lewis, 13, 51, 76 n., 126.
Throgmorton, Elizabeth, 86.
Thyer, Robert, 60, 147.
Tibullus, 56.
Todd, Henry John, 2, 11, 28 n., 37, 51, 106, 139-157, 160.
Tonson, Jacob, 33, 48 n., 63.
Tonsons (nephews of Jacob), 60, 63, 73, 74 n.
Tonson octavo, 58, 63, 73, 74, 104, 145 n.
Tuve, Rosemond, 91 n., 134 n.
Tyrwhitt, Thomas, 13, 147.

Una, 109.
Upton, John, 2, 4 n., 58, 59, 60, 73, 74-102, 109, 115, 120, 125, 134, 139, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 154, 160.
Urry, 109.
Ussher, Archbishop, 8, 24.

Valerius, 56.
Variorum edition, 62, 139-157; *see also* Todd, H. J.
Versification, 47, 70, 116, 125-126, 140; *see also* alliteration; rhyme; pictorial quality; Spenserian stanza; language.
Verstegen, 109.
View of the State of Ireland, A, 1, 8, 11, 17, 19, 68, 139, 142, 144.

Virgil, 14; Spenser, the English Virgil, 17, 38 n., 40, 41, 45, 57, 90, 91, 101, 108, 117.
Virgils Gnat, 57, 112, 152; *see also Complaints.*
Visions of Bellay, The, see Complaints.
Visions of Petrarch, The, see Complaints.
Visions of the Worlds Vanitie, see Complaints.
Vocabulary, *see* Language.
Voyage du Chevalier errant, Le, 149.

Waldron, 139.
Walker, J. C., 143, 147, 156.
Walkley, Thomas, 11.
Waller, Edmund, 55 n.
Walpole, Horace, 33 n., 63 n., 120 n.
Ware, Sir James, 1, 8-9, 11, 15, 17, 19, 20, 23, 29, 50, 68, 69, 110 n., 111.
Warton, Joseph, 16 n., 143.
Warton, Thomas, 44, 74, 75, 94, 110, 115-136, 143, 148, 149, 155, 157.
Wesley, John, 156.
West, Gilbert, 75, 84, 89, 93, 94 n., 96, 97 n.
Whitehall Evening-Post, 60.
Whitgift, 84.
Winstanley, William, 26, 154.
Wood, A., 116 n.
Wood, Robert, 22 n.
Woodford, Samuel, 24.
Worthington, John, 20-22, 68.

Zodiake of Life, 91 n.

VITA

Jewel Wurtsbaugh was born in Jefferson, Texas, June 8, 1896. She received her early education at Jefferson and Sherman, Texas. In 1919 she entered Barnard College, graduating in 1921 with a Bachelor of Arts degree; later, in 1926, she received a Master of Arts degree from Columbia University. She entered The Johns Hopkins University in September 1930.